MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2001 AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE 6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD PORTAGE, IN

REAL ESTATE EXECUTIVE SESSION 4:30 P.M. PROMPT

WORK STUDY SESSION - 5:00 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order by Chairman William Tanke
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Recognition of Visitors and Guests
4. Approval of Minutes of January 10, 2001
5. Chairman’s Report
   • New Committee structure
   • Announce Retreat date
6. Executive Director’s Report
   • Project Wetland Mitigation/Permit – Status
     > Next steps
   • Other issues
7. Standing Committees

A. Land Acquisition/Management Committee – Chuck Agnew, Chairman
   - Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
   - COE Real Estate meeting held January 22, 2001
   - Other issues

B. Project Engineering Committee – Bob Huffman, Chairman
   - Upcoming meeting on February 6 for Grant Street utility field check
   - Stage VII engineering review
   - Other issues

C. Legislative Committee – George Carlson, Chairman
   - State Budget request status – House Ways & Means Budget mark-up
   - Update – Meeting with Editorial Boards at Times and Post Tribune
   - Other issues

D. Recreational Development Committee – Curtis Vosti, Chairman
   - Received response from Lake County Highway Dept. regarding cantilever walkway off Kennedy Avenue bridge
   - Report on meeting with Gas City on January 23rd
   - Other issues

E. Marina Development Committee – Bill Tanke, Chairman
   - Report on Lake Michigan Marina Development Commission meeting
     > Funding status
   - Portage Marina launch ramp issue
   - Lake Michigan lake levels – Steve Davis
   - Other issues

F. Finance/Policy Committee – Arlene Colvin, Chairperson
   - Financial status report
   - Approval of claims for January 2001
   - COE letter received requesting $671,410 as 5% cash contribution through June 2001
   - Other issues

G. Minority Contracting Committee – Marion Williams, Chairman
   - Reports available from the COE for ongoing projects through November, 2000
   - 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. WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2001
AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, INDIANA

In Chairman Emerson Delaney’s absence, Vice Chairman William Tanke called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Nine (9) Commissioners were present. Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Quorum was declared and guests were recognized.

Development Commissioners:  
George Carlson  
Charles Agnew  
John Mroczkowski  
William Tanke  
Curt Vosti  
Bob Huffman  
Arlene Colvin  
Steve Davis  
Mark Reshkin

Visitors:  
Don Ewoldt – Lake Erie Land Company  
Sandy O’Brien – Dunelands Sierra Club  
Jay Scriba – Hobart  
Mona Scriba – Hobart  
Michael Gee – Hobart  
Howard Anderson – Griffith  
Donna Gonzalez – Griffith  
Peter Wilkin – Sierra Club  
Jim Sweeney – Izaak Walton League  
Jim Piekarczyk – Sierra Club  
Betty Blossey – Sierra Club  
Lorraine Karwowski – Sierra Club  
Jim Flora – R.W. Armstrong Company  
Jomary Crary – IDNR, Div. of Water  
Dale Gick – IDNR, Div. of Water

Commissioner Chuck Agnew made a motion to approve the minutes of December 13, 2000; motion seconded by Curt Vosti; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman’s Report - Chuck Agnew, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, gave his report. The Nominating Committee met several times and he proceeded to recommend the following slate of officers for 2001:

Mr. Agnew made a motion to elect John Mroczkowski as Secretary; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Agnew made a motion to elect Curtis Vosti as Treasurer; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Agnew made a motion to elect Bob Huffman as Vice Chairman; motion seconded by John Mroczkowski; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Agnew made a motion to elect William Tanke as Chairman; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously. There were no other nominations.

Although Commissioner George Carlson voted in favor of the 2001 officers, he proceeded to remind the Board members of a motion made in 1997 to set a goal to try to have as many members as possible serve in the
capacity of officers and committee chairmen in order to provide each member with an opportunity to serve annually on an equitable basis.

Vice Chairman Bill Tanke took the seat as Chairman and proceeded with the meeting. He stated that he thinks this is probably the most critical year the Commission has every faced, in terms of anticipated construction and a funding crisis at the same time. He asked staff to set up a retreat meeting with the Board members to discuss the key issues and develop a targeted strategy to meet the year’s challenges.

**Executive Director’s Report**  - Mr. Gardner updated the Board members with the project wetland mitigation report. Discussion centered on acquiring a permit and the matrix we’ve received from the COE. No construction will begin in the west reach until a DNR permit is secured and we have met IDEM 401 water quality certification. The work on a mitigation plan has been ongoing for quite awhile now with no perfect answer yet. Mitigation must be pursued in an expeditious manner. A public working session was held today at 3 p.m. in which the COE and DNR were present. The matrix was studied and the “Team” recommendation is Hobart Marsh area for forested wetlands. The COE is responsible for designing the plan that will be submitted to IDNR. We are the “Submitter” but the COE will write it. Discussion ensued on a “third party” that would maintain the mitigation area once selected. The matrix lists candidate properties that are ranked by a number of categories. Review is still ongoing. Mr. Gardner distributed letters that we have been receiving from area environmentalists that were in strong support of the Hobart Marsh. Mr. Vosti asked Mr. Gardner what he thought of the letters. Mr. Gardner replied that the Commission has always acted in a responsible way and all meetings regarding this subject have been public meetings and media has been noticed. And with having less than $1.2 million and not being a taxing body, we have to move ahead guardedly. Chairman Tanke concluded the discussion by saying that whatever this Commission has done, it has always been in the best interest of the citizens.

**Land Acquisition/Management Committee**  - Committee Chairman Chuck Agnew announced that there were no increased offers or condemnations this month. Mr. Agnew informed the Board members that staff is in the process of acquiring 2 parcels of land in the ERR area, with each property possessing a Lamar billboard sign lease. Once acquired, no new sign agreements will be signed until Lamar finalizes the old sign agreements that are existing. Mr. Agnew reported that we have asked the COE to eliminate acquisitions on the University Park Medical Center because of topographical changes. We are awaiting a response. Appraisal on Woodmar County Club is ongoing.

**Project Engineering Committee**  - Committee Chairman Bob Huffman gave the engineering report. He reported that a pre-bid meeting was held January 4th for the North 5th St. pump station. Bid due date will be extended from January 10th to February 6th. Staff sent a letter to the COE that we concur with Town of Highland that the new electric service for the North 5th St. pump station should be a project cost. Mr. Huffman also reported that the Stage III remediation contract from Chase to Grant will include miscellaneous “clean-up”
work for the East Reach, including recreational trail relocations, paving of ramps, gates, and signage. Also reported was that we have received a letter from Highland indicating that they do not want ownership of pumps that are being removed as part of the west reach pump station project. Mr. Huffman referred to a preliminary compilation of contractual costs that have been completed showing original COE costs estimates, estimates at time of bid openings, contract cost, and final contract costs.

**Legislative Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson gave the report. At the last Legislative Committee meeting, it was decided to engage in a more vigorous program to obtain State funding support. He talked about how difficult it has been to keep up with the COE schedule. Although the project has been going on for 20 years, the actual construction is only half-complete. It is critical to obtain more state money to complete the entire project. The Governor has submitted his budget and we understand that a recommendation of $4.5 million ($3 million in the General Fund and $1.5 million from the redirected Build Indiana Fund) for the Development Commission. We have meeting times with the Editorial Boards at The Times and Post Tribune for January 16th and 16th, respectively. Mr. Gardner invited Board members to accompany him. Mr. Huffman inquired whether the Governor’s budget has to be voted on. Mr. Gardner replied that the Governor’s Budget is only a recommendation. The House Ways & Means will do a mark-up and then the Senate will do a mark-up. From that point, they will negotiate a final complete budget. It is hoped that the final budget would be known by the end of April. It would probably be July before any new money can be drawn upon. Concern now is to not only try to increase this amount but definitely not have the $4.5 million amount decreased.

**Recreational Development Committee** – Committee Chairman Curt Vosti informed the Board members that a letter was sent to the Lake County Highway Dept. on December 28th requesting permission and comments to cantilever a walkway on the east side of the Kennedy Avenue bridge to allow the trail to be contiguous. Mr. Vosti also reported that a supplemental contract will be released in late spring of 2001 as part of the Stage III remediation project in that will include the paving of all ramps.

**Marina Committee** – There was no report.

**Finance Committee** – Committee Chairperson Arlene Colvin gave the finance report. In order to stay within the year 2000 budget, a budget transfer of funds is necessary. She proceeded to make a motion to approve the transfer of $12,000 from Line 5838 to Line 5812; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously. She referred to the monthly financial status sheet and claims in the amount of $92,498.24 and proceeded to make a motion approving the claims; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

**Minority Contracting Committee** – There was no report.

**Other Business** – Commissioner Curt Vosti made a motion directing staff to send a letter to the Lake County Commissioners’ Office with the attendance sheets for the years 1999 and 2000 to make them aware of their appointee’s attendance record; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.
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Mr. Vosti questioned staff as to the Woodmar Country Club appraisal not being completed yet. The appraiser has asked approval to hire a golf course architect and a golf course construction expert to assist him in finalizing his appraisal. After discussion, Mr. Vosti made a motion not to approve hiring any additional experts until the appraiser can meet and provide additional information (who, why, and how much money); motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously. Concern was expressed that hiring additional people may delay the appraisal process even more but it was felt that the issue is important enough that it warrants further investigation. Mr. Vosti has requested some detailed information on this subject several times and expressed dismay that he has not received it. Attorney Casale has had a concern on the legality of releasing information before the appraisal is complete. Land Acquisition Agent Judy Vamos stated she would copy the complete file for review. It was decided that the attorney would write a letter to the appraiser stating that he was not to hire any additional people until they could meet and discuss this issue. Attorney will copy the letter to Board members.

Statements to the Board – Sandy O’Brien and Jim Sweeney both indicated that many of the environmentalists would help in voicing a concern for increased state funding, especially if they were assured that Hobart Marsh would be the selected mitigation site. Chairman Tanke thanked them for their offer of assistance.

Further discussion ensued on how we optioned some of our property to Lake Erie Land Company in order to develop a fund for future operation and maintenance of the wetlands.

Don Ewolt said it would be helpful to the Commission if a dollar value on the properties was known. At least you could compare the dollar value to determine which would be more economically feasible – land that would cost you nothing versus land that would be very expensive.

Judy Vamos offered to put together some preliminary cost estimates for these properties. We could do a sample appraisal that would give us an indication of the dollar value. Chairman Tanke indicated this would be a good idea. Staff will report back.

Staff was asked to look at dates to set up a retreat meeting.

There being no further business, the next regular Commission meeting was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. for a Work Study session and 6:00 for the regular Board meeting on Thursday, February 1, 2001.

/sjm
BETWEEN THE LINES

Behind the daily news stories

The daily grind takes its toll on executive director

As executive director of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, Dan Gardner's job includes negotiating with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which is building a $161 million flood control and recreation project along the Little Calumet River. Dealing with the corps can grind a person down, he said after looking at a photograph of himself in a 1984 issue of The Times.

"When I started on this project, I was six-foot-four and looked like Tom Selleck. Now I'm five-foot-four and look like Danny DeVito," he said.

"Hard telling how short he'll be when the project is completed. State studies began in 1975, but the construction isn't likely to be finished until 2008."
It's time General Assembly met its Little Calumet obligation

**Our opinion:** Flood control project deserves a higher priority in state budget.

There is a lot more at stake this session of the General Assembly for Northwest Indiana than dockside gambling. The future of flood control along the Little Calumet River hangs in the balance, and given its low priority in Indianapolis right now, it might not get the attention it deserves.

That's potentially devastating to Northwest Indiana. The $181 million project is about half done, and unless Indiana contributes more money this budget cycle than it has the two previous ones, the project will come to a halt.

Members of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission have been working since 1987 to build levees along the Little Calumet to eliminate flooding problems that have historically plagued the area. About 10 miles of the project remain to be completed.

At least three major floods have inundates areas of Hammond, Highland, Griffith and Munster since 1957, and with more than 9,500 structures in the floodplain, the potential for millions of dollars in property damage still exists.

The problem is this: federal funding for the project has been plentiful. The project has drawn bipartisan support from Indiana's U.S. senators and representatives to the tune of $22.5 million over the past three fiscal years.

At the same time, state funding has been a paltry $1.5 million, and until more money is appropriated by the General Assembly, the flow of federal money will stop.
The danger in that is the Little Calumet project could languish for years before it regains federal funding, putting at risk another important water clean-up project in the region - the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal.

U.S. Rep. Pete Visclosky, who has funneled much of the money to Northwest Indiana, said it's time the Little Calumet project was completed. He would like to begin cleaning up the ship canal (one of the most polluted waterways in the United States), but his colleagues in the house are reluctant to sign off on a new water project until the current one is finished.

Following a resolution by the Commission asking for $12 million from the General Assembly to meet its obligation to the feds, Gov. Frank O'Bannon included $4.5 million in his budget ($1.5 million of that is to come from Build Indiana Funds).

That's better than nothing, and three times as much as the commission has gotten in the last two budgets. But it's not enough.

Members of the General Assembly view the project as a Northwest Indiana project, but it's not. The commission was created by the General Assembly to act as a state agency responsible for the project, since the Indiana Department of Natural Resources didn't have the authority, by law, to oversee the work.

"This has never been a controversial project," said Dan Gardner, the commission's executive director. "The problem has been the feds have moved faster than the state."

This is an obligation the General Assembly must see through. Not only will the project eliminate flooding, it will also include hiking trails and other recreational opportunities (Lake Etta County Park was created as part of this project) and preserve threatened wetlands. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that when complete, the flood control project will save the state an average of $15 million a year in flood damage.

Indiana made a commitment to this project in 1987. It's time that commitment was fulfilled.

Back...
January 23, 2001

Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

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

RE: Lake County Bridge #143, Kennedy Avenue over the Little Calumet River

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

The Lake County Highway Department has received your letter of December 28, 2000, regarding the possibility of attaching a walkway to Lake County Bridge #143, Kennedy Avenue over the Little Calumet River. Per your letter the walkway is part of the Army Corp of Engineers plan for a recreational trail system along the banks of the Little Calumet River with Kennedy Avenue being a point of crossing the river.

Lake County Bridge #143 was constructed in 1955 and currently has a gross rating of 20 tons. Structurally the bridge is in fair condition with the following structural characteristics:

1. The deck is a reinforced concrete slab with fair to heavy spalling at the Centerline joint.

2. The superstructure is also a reinforced concrete slab with exposed and rusted rebar.

3. The substructure is a concrete cap on steel piles with spalling and exposed rebar on the cap.

The estimated remaining life of the deck and superstructure is ten (10) years with the substructure having an estimated life of thirteen (13) years.

Your request is to install a walkway that would cantilever off the side of the existing bridge. The possibility of doing this probably does exist but the feasibility of the cantilever walkway would have to be answered given the design and condition of the existing bridge.

For the Lake County Highway Department to consider your request a professional engineer would have to review the existing structure design and conditions to determine if a cantilever walkway is feasible. If it were feasible then a professional engineer would have to design the walkway. Both the initial review of the structure and any subsequent design would be required to be submitted to the Highway Department for review and comments.

If Lake County considers this possibility then some type of agreement would have to be in place spelling out maintenance of and future replacement of the cantilever structure.
A second possibility would be to build a stand alone pedestrian bridge along side the existing bridge. There are companies that do specialize in pedestrian and golf course bridges. I suggest that this option also be investigated.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Duane A. Alverson, P.E.
Engineer

DAA/daa

C: Marcus Malczewski, Superintendent
   Jill Stochel, Assistant Superintendent
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

TOTAL RECEIPTS: 1,587,147.79

RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - DECEMBER 31, 2000
- LEASE RENTS: 51,221.29
- INTEREST INCOME: 80,595.57
- LAND ACQUISITION: 2,635,493.08
- ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST: 9,746.93
- MISC. INCOME: 78,487.65
- KBRC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE: 1,763.83
- PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS: 200,150.38

TOTAL RECEIPTS: 3,007,458.73

DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2000 - DECEMBER 31, 2000
ADMINISTRATIVE
- 1999 EXPENSES PAID IN 2000: 88,437.89
- PER DIEM: 10,650.00
- LEGAL SERVICES: 7,663.96
- NIRPC: 117,964.14
- TRAVEL & MILEAGE: 16,489.32
- PRINTING & ADVERTISING: 1,013.09
- BONDS & INSURANCE: 5,802.63
- TELEPHONE EXPENSE: 9,196.61
- MEETING EXPENSE: 9,897.00

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS: 201,267.02

CASH POSITION - DECEMBER 31, 2000
CHECKING ACCOUNT
- LAND ACQUISITION: 541,026.11
- GENERAL FUND: 49,902.51

INVESTMENTS
- BANK CALUMET: 316,000.00
- BANK CALUMET: 700,000.00
- BANK ONE: 105,116.15
- BANK CALUMET: 92,831.76
- BANK ONE: 12,258.90
- BANK ONE: 123,053.70
- BANK ONE: 1,247,109.73

TOTAL INVESTMENTS: 2,596,370.26

ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST: 21,476.77
TOTAL: 3,208,775.63
## Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
### Monthly Budget Report, December 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6 MONTH ALLOCATED</th>
<th>UNALLOCATED BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>283.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIPRC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,091.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MEILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>24.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>199.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>108.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>7,125.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>41,709.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>1,507,081.00</td>
<td>2,019.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>18,244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>3,464.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,623,081.00</td>
<td>73,998.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 MONTH UNALLOCATED</th>
<th>ALLOCATED</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>10,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>432.33</td>
<td>4,549.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIPRC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>10,780.34</td>
<td>16,291.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MEILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>1,351.50</td>
<td>9,567.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>3,066.11</td>
<td>4,432.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,841.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>473.68</td>
<td>5,803.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>2,444.38</td>
<td>2,274.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>7,311.65</td>
<td>51,560.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>24,640.11</td>
<td>23,197.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>1,307,081.00</td>
<td>10,550.30</td>
<td>1,213,289.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,699.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,554.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,697.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,623,081.00</td>
<td>74,442.72</td>
<td>846,055.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Budgeted amounts** are rounded to the nearest whole number.
- **Allocated amounts** are calculated by subtracting **Budgeted amounts** from the **Total** amounts.
- **Unallocated amounts** are calculated by subtracting **Allocated amounts** from the **Budgeted amounts**.
### Monthly Budget Report, January 2001

#### 2001 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Total Allocated</th>
<th>Unallocated</th>
<th>Budgeted Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>903.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>903.83</td>
<td>7,596.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>8,860.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,860.29</td>
<td>116,139.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>2,306.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,306.00</td>
<td>2,694.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>113.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113.26</td>
<td>6,886.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>137.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137.05</td>
<td>7,862.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>62,500.00</td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
<td>58,592.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>43,899.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,899.76</td>
<td>206,100.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>678,622.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>678,622.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>11,950.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 1,432,122.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>Total Allocated</th>
<th>Unallocated</th>
<th>Budgeted 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>0.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>903.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>903.83</td>
<td>7,596.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>8,860.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,860.29</td>
<td>116,139.71</td>
<td></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>0.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>2,306.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,306.00</td>
<td>2,694.00</td>
<td></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>0.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>113.26</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>113.26</td>
<td>6,886.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>137.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>137.05</td>
<td>7,862.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>62,500.00</td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
<td>58,592.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>43,899.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>43,899.76</td>
<td>206,100.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>678,622.00</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>678,622.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>12,500.00</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>11,950.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>100,000.00</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>0.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</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>0.00</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>12,500.00</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>0.00</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 1,432,122.00

**Notes:**
- The budget and allocated amounts are listed for each category.
- The budgeted balance is calculated by subtracting the allocated amounts from the budget amounts.
- The total amounts for both 6 months and 12 months are provided for each category.
<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 FOR 1/2/01-1/22/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>620.50</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL LEGAL SERVICES FOR JANUARY 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>NIRC</td>
<td>8,660.29</td>
<td>SERVICES PERFORMED DECEMBER 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>ATLANTIC TECHNOLOGIES LLC</td>
<td>2,266.00</td>
<td>COST OF MAPS OF PROJECT AREA (TO BE REIMBURSED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>TROPHY SOURCE</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>PURCHASE OF PLAQUE FOR OUTGOING CHAIRMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824</td>
<td>VERIZON</td>
<td>113.26</td>
<td>BILLING PERIOD 1/16/01-2/16/01 TOTAL BILL 236.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KRBC PORTION 123.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>57.05</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES INCURRED 1/9/01 FOR NOMINATING COMMITTEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES INCURRED 1/22/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5836</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/LEGAL SERVICES 1/3/01-1/22/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICES FOR DC-1105, 1106 &amp; 1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>MARTINEZ, SHARMAT &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>175.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>3,163.92</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDING 1/12/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>GARCIA LE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>4,390.02</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES SVI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-344-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-1104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-810A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-810B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION</td>
<td>275.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JAMES POKRAJAC</td>
<td>3,634.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING/LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 1/2/01-1/12/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>JUDITH VANOS</td>
<td>2,145.00</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 1/2/01-1/15/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUIS</td>
<td>294.00</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 1/2/01-1/11/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>618.75</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN &amp; LAND ACQUISITION ASST 1/3/01-1/11/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SV-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>2,200.03</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SVI-3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SV-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>422.50</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SV-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>2,695.00</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SVI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>4,282.50</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SVI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>5,583.08</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SVI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>5,620.00</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR SVI-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>CNA</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>COST OF INSURANCE FOR STRUCTURE @ 35TH &amp; CHASE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 60,677.67
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
11 NORTH CANAL STREET  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606-7206  

January 24, 2001  

Project Management Branch  

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:  

I'm writing this letter as a follow up to the discussion we had at the real estate meeting last Monday. At the meeting, I informed you that I would be requesting additional local funding. The funding will be used to meet our construction contract execution for the months of January through June 2001. The list below shows the construction contract and the fund required:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Contract</th>
<th>Required Funds $</th>
<th>%Completion Thru June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street Phasel</td>
<td>422,508</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1A</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV-1 South</td>
<td>34,491</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 5th Pump</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1B</td>
<td>95,410</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>671,410</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above I'm requesting that you deposit the total of $671,410 into the project's escrow accounts. A sum of $421,500 be deposited in the Burr Street Betterment escrow account number 7500-0441-5892 (design fund). And, a sum of $249,910 be deposited in the construction escrow account number 7500-0244-4747 (construction fund).  

I'm aware of your funding saturation, that's why I waited on requesting the funds until it was absolutely necessary to maintain the construction contracts progress. We need you to deposit the funds as soon as it can be done. If you have any questions please contact me at 312-353-6400.  

[Signature]  
Imad M. Samara  
Project Manager
## Financial Statement

**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**  
**JANUARY 1, 2001 - JANUARY 31, 2001**

### CASE POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECKING ACCOUNT</td>
<td>541,026.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>49,952.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX FUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENTS</td>
<td>2,596,370.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
<td>214,468.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Receipts - January 1, 2001 - January 31, 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEASE RENTS</td>
<td>3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>1,434.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>216,148.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
<td>173.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. INCOME</td>
<td>16,846.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRFC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Receipts**  
237,704.26

### Disbursements - January 1, 2001 - January 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>133,171.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 EXPENSES PAID IN 2001</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DIEM</td>
<td>683.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>18,476.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPC</td>
<td>499.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; MILEAGE</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; ADVERTISING</td>
<td>734.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDS &amp; INSURANCE</td>
<td>1,276.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,127.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING ALLOCATION</td>
<td>1,154.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES/PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS SERVICES</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND MANGEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>16,835.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES</td>
<td>16,407.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC/MARKETING SOURCES</td>
<td>1,431.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; STRUCTURE COSTS</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING ALLOCATION</td>
<td>1,138.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</td>
<td>558,382.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Position - January 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECKING ACCOUNT</td>
<td>241,049.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>29,020.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>126,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX FUND</td>
<td>12,987.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENTS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANK CALUMET</td>
<td>316,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK CALUMET</td>
<td>700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>162,484.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>12,593.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>123,208.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>1,033,517.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>393,817.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Investments**  
2,647,338.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
<td>21,650.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**  
3,139,059.97
RECREATION REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, February 1, 2001

(Information in this report is from January 2, 2001 – January 29, 2001)

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.

- A supplemental contract will be released as part of the Stage III remediation project in the late spring of 2001 that will include the paving of all ramps.

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.

EAST REACH RECREATION

A. We have an existing agreement with Gary for constructing the ramp down from the levee, West of Broadway.

- We received a letter of response from INDOT on October 18 indicating no concerns regarding the crossing as long as we coordinate with the locals, and that a right-of-way permit with them would be required.

- Had a meeting with Roland Elvambucena (Gary City Engineer) on December 6th, 2000, to remind them of our October 18th, 2000 request. We anticipate a response by the end of the year. (We have not received as of February 1, 2001)
B. LCRBDC is going to coordinate a revised recreation trail alignment at Grant Street.
   1. The original plan was to run the trail South of the existing levee, along the East side of Gas City. They originally objected but appear to be re-considering and will meet with us this January.
   2. A meeting was held with Len McEnery (Gas City) General Manager, on January 23, 2001 to review our re-location.
      • We are considering re-locating our trail further east (near Gilroy Stadium) to avoid construction in a wetland, and will have a meeting with the Gary Parks & Rec and the COE.

WEST REACH RECREATION

A. We received a copy of a letter from INDOT to RANI ENGINEERING (Stage VI Phase 2) on January 8, 2001 indicating their concerns regarding our recreation trail crossing, on adjacent to, Cline Avenue.
   1. A meeting will be scheduled with INDOT and the COE by early February to review this situation.

   1. The COE is still in the process of modifying the engineering and real estate drawings. It is still the intent to have this recreation trail on the land side.
   2. North Township – Wicker Park recreational trail alignment is being evaluated.
      • It was mentioned to re-locate the trail from between the golf courses to the existing trail along the West and South boundaries.
      • North Township would not have a problem, but are awaiting information from INDOT for impacts to Indianapolis Blvd. R/W which would cause their existing trail to be re-located.

C. A letter was sent to the Lake County Highway Dept. on December 28, 2000 requesting permission, and comments, to cantilever a walkway on the east side of the Kennedy Avenue bridge to allow our trail to be contiguous.
   1. We received a letter from the Lake County Highway Dept. on January 23, 2001 suggesting we contract a professional engineer to review the structure design for feasibility. If feasible, then he would design a system.
      • We requested plans, specifications, and recent inspection reports to allow proper review.
FRANK O'BANNON, Governor
CRISTINE M. KLIKA, Commissioner
Rani Engineering, Inc.
556 Rice Street
St. Paul, MN 55103

Ann: Susan P. Rani, PE

Dear Ms. Rani:

I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter of September 12, 2000 regarding the Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project -- Stage 6 Phase 2.

In response to your request for input on the three issues you raise, we offer the following:

- **Slide Gates on Highway Culverts**: The culverts in place were insulated to equalize the water level on each side of SR 912, Cline Avenue, so as not to cause unequal pressure on the highway embankment. The fill material used to construct the roadway was sand. The embankment was not designed nor intended to serve as a levee to retain a higher water level on one side. The use of slide gates would cause unequal water pressure on the embankment and endanger the roadway. This cannot be allowed.

- **Recreational Trail on INDOT ROW**: INDOT does not construct nor maintain recreational trails. We do have some crossing our facilities. These are constructed and maintained by agencies/organizations through our permit process. The location of your proposed trail is along a local service/access road. Although INDOT constructed it we will be attempting to relinquish control and maintenance of it to the appropriate local jurisdiction. Any permit to construct a trail would be subject to approval of the local jurisdiction.

- **Signal for Pedestrian Crossing on Cline Avenue**: INDOT has serious concerns with this request. Motorists on SR 912 are in no way going to expect pedestrians crossing the highway. This is not a good location for a pedestrian crossing.

Please contact me at the above address or e-mail: abraham@indot.state.in.us or telephone (219) 325-7520 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Donald C. Abraham
Development Engineer

cc: Eric Sampson USACE-Chicago
January 23, 2001

Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

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

RE: Lake County Bridge #143, Kennedy Avenue over the Little Calumet River

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

The Lake County Highway Department has received your letter of December 28, 2000, regarding the possibility of attaching a walkway to Lake County Bridge #143, Kennedy Avenue over the Little Calumet River. Per your letter the walkway is part of the Army Corp of Engineers plan for a recreational trail system along the banks of the Little Calumet River with Kennedy Avenue being a point of crossing the river.

Lake County Bridge #143 was constructed in 1955 and currently has a gross rating of 20 tons. Structurally the bridge is in fair condition with the following structural characteristics:

1. The deck is a reinforced concrete slab with fair to heavy spalling at the Centerline joint.

2. The superstructure is also a reinforced concrete slab with exposed and rusted rebar.

3. The substructure is a concrete cap on steel piles with spalling and exposed rebar on the cap.

The estimated remaining life of the deck and superstructure is ten (10) years with the substructure having an estimated life of thirteen (13) years.

Your request is to install a walkway that would cantilever off the side of the existing bridge. The possibility of doing this probably does exist but the feasibility of the cantilever walkway would have to be answered given the design and condition of the existing bridge.

For the Lake County Highway Department to consider your request a professional engineer would have to review the existing structure design and conditions to determine if a cantilever walkway is feasible. If it were feasible then a professional engineer would have to design the walkway. Both the initial review of the structure and any subsequent design would be required to be submitted to the Highway Department for review and comments.

If Lake County considers this possibility then some type of agreement would have to be in place spelling out maintenance of and future replacement of the cantilever structure.
A second possibility would be to build a stand alone pedestrian bridge along side the existing bridge. There are companies that do specialize in pedestrian and golf course bridges. I suggest that this option also be investigated.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Duane A. Alverson, P.E.
Engineer

DAA/daa

C: Marcus Malczewski, Superintendent
   Jill Stochel, Assistant Superintendent
Dan Gardner, Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission,
6100 Southport Rd.,
Portage, IN 46368

Dan,

Sandy O'Brien has been watching the development of the Corps of Engineers mitigation project closely and we at the Izaak Walton League are very grateful for her vigilance. We have too many things to do and not enough members to do them.

I am disappointed that this mitigation problem has not yet been settled.

It appears that the Little Calumet River Basin Commission is still considering the Lake Erie Land proposal. Why is this? The Indiana DNR and DEM and the US Fish and Wildlife Service have visited both sites and have stated their support the Hobart Marsh site. This in itself should put an end to the debate.

Congressman Visclosky supports the Hobart Marsh and if it were not for him, there would be no Little Cal project.

The DNR requires that the mitigation be for forested wetland and the land the LEL offers was not a forested wetland nor can it be made to grow a forested wetland.

Then we must consider the price of each project. There again, the Hobart Marsh site would cost only one-third what the Lake Erie Land proposal would.

This debate on this should have been over long ago.

I have to assume that the only reason this has not yet been resolved is because of political pressure being applied by LEL. For this reason, any members of the LCRBDC board of directors that have any kind of tie to LEL or to NIPSCO should excuse themselves from any action that may be required of the board.

This is how I see this situation. The LCRBDC is still considering an offer for mitigation by LEL that no other agencies support, that the local Congressman does not support, that will cost three times as many tax dollars, and finally, will not work or satisfy the state permits.

For the record, the Griffith chapter of the Izaak Walton League still supports the mitigation site as was agreed at the July 15, 1999 meeting between all the agencies involved. We support the
Hobart Marsh site because of the increased benefits of a larger preserve and the fact that the cost and success of the mitigation requires that the LEL site be removed from consideration.

Thank you,

Jim Sweeney, chairman
Conservation Committee
Griffith Izaak Walton League
c/o 1773 Selo Dr.
Schererville, IN 46375

Imad Samara, Project Manager, US Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District, CELRC-PP-FM, 111 N. Canal St., Chicago, IL 60606-7206

Bill Maudlin, Indiana DNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife, 402 W. Washington St., Rm. W-273, Indianapolis, IN 46204

Representative Peter Visclosky (attention Mark Lopez) 215 W. 35th Ave, Gary, IN 46408

Marty Maupin, Project Manager, IDEM, 100 N. Senate Ave., PO Box 6015, Indianapolis, IN 46206-6015
Dan Gardner, Executive Director and Commission Chairman  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner,

I am writing to express my concerns over the potential mishandling of the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan. As a member of REP America, the National Grassroots Organization of Republicans for Environmental Protection, I am always concerned when I see taxpayer funds being mishandled, and further outraged when it results in environmental damage. An effort to give the Hobart Marsh project to Lake Erie Land seems to do both.

Why has so much effort been made to give the mitigation to Lake Erie Land when their land is unsuitable for the mitigation and they have stated they want $11.1 million or more to do it. [Hobart Marsh might be done for about $3.4 million.] It is a violation of the public trust to set up this taxpayer-funded mitigation project to go to private business like LEL. Furthermore, Commission members with ties to LEL and NIPSCO should recuse themselves from the mitigation issue.

Going with Hobart Marsh shows fiscal responsibility. The land is still reasonably priced due to poor drainage and lack of city sewer and water. The restoration work is going to be cheaper because working with Mother Nature to restore what once was is easier than trying to create something new (as LEL would have to do because their land was a shallow lake). Why should taxpayers pay an extra $5 to 7 million for LEL’s profit?

Hobart Marsh is by far the ecologically best choice for mitigation. The agencies (DNR, IDEM, US FWS) have agreed that Hobart Marsh is the best site because of the great advantage a mega-preserve has for wildlife; plus the adjacent native habitat in nature preserves and fencerows makes restoration of farmland to wet oak savanna easier and more successful. Hobart Marsh clearly provides the best bang for the buck. It is the most ecologically stable site with the least invasive exotic weed problems.

Hobart Marsh is the chance for the Little Cal Commission to leave a real ecological legacy to mitigate the ecological damage done to wetlands and high quality natural areas such as Tolleston by the levee project.

Environmental and recreational amenities were used to raise the marginal cost benefit ratio for the levee project enough to qualify for funding. Both need to be done well for taxpayers to get their money’s worth. LEL’s mitigation plan is a sham, with doubtful long-term success, and would not be a bargain at any cost. Thank you for your consideration on this important matter.

Sincerely,

David R. Herrington  
Dyer, Indiana  
REP America Indiana State Coordinator
Mrs. Betty K. Blossey
34 Ogden Road
Portage, IN 46368
January 6, 2001

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

Dear Mrs. Gardner,

I am writing to ask that the Little Calumet River Development Commission get started on the Hobart Marsh mitigation at the January 10, 2001 meeting. The cost of the Hobart Marsh mitigation would be well under half the cost of the Lake Erie Land site that for some reason is still being considered. The Hobart Marsh plan involves relatively easy restoration of forested wetlands - the other site involves creation of forested wetlands while trying to eliminate lots of invasive alien plants. Success of the latter would be doubtful, and maintenance costs would be high. The Hobart Marsh mitigation also has excellent additional ecological benefits.

Please stop the delay and get the Hobart marsh mitigation going.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

Betty K. Blossey

Copies sent to:
Congressman Pete Visclosky
Bill Mauldin, Indiana DNR
Penny Macphee, IDEM
Colonel Mark Romolo, US Army Corps of Engineers

I wrote in Aug. 2000 on this matter.
Dear Sir,

I am writing in regards to the Corps of Engineers’ mitigation project that could end up restoring about 300 acres of land in an area of Hobart called Hobart Marsh. I would like to let you know that this seems like sound mitigation plan, and that I am very much in favor of this plan. It is my understanding that the project has the backing of the DNR, IDEM, US Fish and Wildlife Service and Congressmen Visclosky’s Office.

I would like to know why it has taken so long to get this project started? I would also like to know why it seems so much effort has been made to give the mitigation to Lake Erie Land. Their land seems unsuitable for the mitigation. Also it seems the cost to do their mitigation would be substantially higher. It seems to be a violation of public trust to set up this taxpayer-funded mitigation project to go to a private business like Lake Erie Land.

Not only does the Hobart Marsh project show fiscal responsibility, the restoration work would be much easier to accomplish. The land is still reasonably priced due to poor drainage and lack of city sewer and water. The restoration work will be easier to accomplish, and therefore cheaper, because it is adjacent to areas with native habitat that once existed there. While with the Lake Erie Land project not only will the land cost more, but instead of restoring what was there they will be trying to create a completely different habitat, which will be much harder, and more expensive, to accomplish.

It is my understanding that Lake Erie Land wants $11.1 million or more to do their project. While the Hobart Marsh cost estimate is $3.4 million. Broken down into: 306 acres at $11,000/acre ($5,000 for land, $1000 for design work, $4,000 for restoration work, $1000 for perpetual stewardship). Why should taxpayers pay almost an extra $7 million for Lake Erie Land’s profit.

Hobart Marsh is by far the ecologically best choice for mitigation. The DNR, IDEM and US FWS have all agreed that Hobart Marsh is the best site because of the great advantage a mega-preserve has for wildlife; plus the adjacent native habitat in nature preserves and fence rows makes restoration of farmland to wet oak savanna easier and more successful. Hobart Marsh clearly provides the most bang for the buck. It is the most ecologically stable site with the least invasive exotic weed problems.
Hobart Mash is the chance for the Little Cal Commission to leave a real ecological legacy to mitigate the ecological damage done to wetlands and high quality natural areas such as Tolleston by the levee project.

Environmental and recreational amenities were used to raise the marginal cost benefit ratios for the levee project enough to qualify for funding. Both need to be done well for taxpayers to get their money's worth. Lake Erie Land's mitigation plan has doubtful long-term success, and would not be a bargain at any cost.

Sincerely,

\[Signature\]
Robert Bryerton

cc: Congressman Peter Visclosky,
Marty Maupin IDEM,
Colnel Mark Roncoli US Army Corps of Engineers,
Bill Maudlin IDNR
Development Commission, at NIRPC in Portage. The purpose of this letter is to advise your work on this plan. I am a biologist, and I belong to several conservation societies which are active locally, including Save the Dunes and the Sierra Club's Duneland Group.

First, although the mitigation plan has been developed since 1997, there has been a delay in getting underway. Delay increases land costs and decreases land choices. The West Reach half of the levee project needs permits, which require mitigation.

Second, the mitigation should not be given to the Lake Erie Land Company (LEL), because their land is unsuitable for the mitigation, and they want $11.1 million for their land, whereas Hobart Marsh may be done for $3.4 million (details are available). It is a violation of public trust and a waste of taxpayer's money to go to LEL. And commission members with ties to LEL and NIPSCO should excuse themselves from the mitigation, as it is a conflict of interest.

Third, the Hobart Marsh forested wetland is much preferable to LEL's wet prairie. The agencies: DNR, IDEM US FWS have agreed that Hobart Marsh is the best site for the mitigation, because of the great advantage that a mega-preserve has for wildlife. It is a fact that habitat fragmentation is a major cause of loss of diversity of animal and plant species.

Hobart Marsh is THE opportunity for the Little Calumet Commission to leave a significant ecological legacy to mitigate the endless damage done by development.

Please support the Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan

Sincerely Yours,

Peter J. Wilkin

cc. Congressman Peter Visclosky,
    Bill Maudlin, Indiana DNR, Department of Fish and Wildlife
    Marty Maupin, Project Manager, IDEM
    Colonel Mark Roncalli, District Engineer, US Army Corps of Engineers,
    Chicago

Peter J. Wilkin, Assoc. Prof., Biology, Purdue U. North Central,
1401 S. US 421, Westville, IN 46391-9542. 219-785-5227, fax -5483
http://faculty.purdueuc.edu/pwilkin

01/08/2001
January 08th., 2001

Mr. Dan Gardner
C/O Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, IN 46368

Re: Hobart Marsh Mitigation Project

I, as many, are in full support of the above project that has won the backing of DNR, IDEM, US Fish and Wildlife Service and Congressman Visclosky's office. This project, while being the most fiscally responsible, remains the best ecological site in the area for both short term and long term costs and benefits.

I'm at a loss in understanding why the Commission has seemed to ignore this site and is considering the Lake Erie Land site in Lake Station for mitigation. This property by contrast is less suitable for mitigation, would be more costly, and with doubtful long-term success.

I ask that you and the Commission quickly move forward on the Hobart project or explain to me why you cannot.

Thank You,

Patti Woronecki
29 N. Wabash St.
Hobart, IN 46342
January 7, 2001
1355 West Springville Road
La Porte, Indiana 46350

Dan Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner:

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Northwest Indiana to support the US Army Corps of Engineers mitigation project that would restore about 300 acres of land in Hobart Marsh. This project would acquire and restore the original wet oak savanna — "forested wetland" habitat.

I do not understand why this plan has been held up for several years and is still not being implemented. Delay increases land costs and decreases the choices of land available. Meanwhile, Lake Erie Land Co. has offered a project that would cost three times as much but would not restore forested wetlands. Little Cal Basin Commission members with ties to Lake Erie Land and to its parent, NIPSCO, should recuse themselves from this issue.

Selecting Hobart Marsh as the mitigation site is fiscally responsible, as the land there is reasonably priced due to poor drainage and lack of city sewer and water. The restoration work will be cheaper than the plan proposed by Lake Erie Land, since it is easier to restore what was once there than to create something new (as LEL would have to do because their land was a shallow lake).

Hobart Marsh is by far the best choice, as the agencies (DNR, IDEM, US Fish and Wildlife) have agreed. Such a mega-preserve would have a great advantage for wildlife; the adjacent native habitats in nature preserves and fence rows would make for easier restoration; the ecological stability of the site would mean fewer problems with invasive weeds.

The levee project has damaged the ecology of wetlands and high quality natural areas. To mitigate adequately for this damage, the Little Cal Basin Commission needs to choose the best alternative. That alternative is the Hobart Marsh.

Sincerely,

Sandra Henderson

cc: Chairperson, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
    Congressman Peter Visclosky
    Bill Maudlin, Indiana Department of Natural Resources
    Marty Maupin, Project Manager, Indiana Department of Environmental Management
    Colonel Mark Roncoli, District Engineer, US Army Corps of Engineers
Mr. Dan Gardner  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner,

I am writing to you today on behalf of the Dunes Calumet Audubon Society. We would like to ask you to support the use of Hobart Marsh as the mitigation area for the Little Cal River Flood Control Project. The restoration of forested wetlands in this area will not only provide additional habitat for migrating and nesting birds, it will also provide a site of high-diversity plant and animal life that could be a quality passive recreation area for the citizens of Northwest Indiana.

Dunes Calumet Audubon sees the benefits of the Hobart Marsh area as follows:

Acquiring additional land in this area would tie together the natural areas already owned by Shirley Heinze, the Izaac Walton League, the IDNR, and the Indiana Dunes National Lake Shore. It could create a mega-preserve corridor for wildlife that would tie to Turkey Creek, Deep River, and Lake George.

This area has forested wetlands soils, fencerows, and a seedbank that should allow the lands to be restored and maintained for wet oak savanna. Invasive exotic weeds are at a minimum. Because these components are already there, restoration in this area should be of significantly higher quality than starting from scratch in the proposed Lake Erie Land site. Cressmoor and School Prairie are examples of the high quality restoration work that has already been accomplished in the area.

We believe the cost will be much less if the Hobart Marsh area is chosen. Lake Erie Land has indicated that they believe restoration costs should mirror Illinois costs of about $40,000 an acre. Shirley Heinze’s costs of $11,000 are much more in line with restoration efforts by local environmental groups. Shirley Heinze has a proven track record of taking care of their lands.

The IDNR, IDEM, U.S. F&WS, Congressman Peter Visclosky, and the local environmental groups have seen the value of Hobart Marsh. I think your officers should consider the cost benefit to the taxpayers of Shirley Heinze’s proposal. This is your chance to protect vanishing wetland forested areas and to leave a great ecological legacy to the citizens of Northwest Indiana and to our migratory and nesting birds.

cc: Congressman Peter Visclosky

Dunes Calumet Audubon Society  
PO Box 1100  
Cedar Lake, IN 46303

Sincerely,

Barb Dodge, Vice President, DCA
January 6, 2001

Dan Gardner, Executive Director and
Commission Chairperson
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner and Commission Chairperson:

We, of Lake County Fish and Game, are very concerned with the progress of wetland mitigation even as the East Reach of the flood control project nears an end.

We are also concerned that the substantial environmental and recreational benefits originally planned have apparently been scuttled in favor of a contract with Lake Erie Land. We view, with a suspicious eye, deals involving private developers leasing publicly held land.

The Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan is environmentally very good. The plan to buffer and link the preserved land in Hobart Marsh with 300 acres of farmland, restored to forested wetland habitat, is a very good idea and deserves the Commission's attention. The land in Hobart Marsh is far more suitable to this type of mitigation and is also far more likely to be successful. At Hobart Marsh the Commission could leave a real environmental legacy similar to the environmental legacy the flood control project was long ago supposed to provide.

We are surprised that Lake Erie Land has been allowed to disrupt the planned mitigation at Hobart Marsh, when the land they are putting up is not suitable for forested wetland restoration, and they have said they want $40,000.00 to $60,000.00 per acre for mitigation. It doesn't seem right that Lake Erie Land should be charging the Commission for use of its own land. We strongly feel that if there are commission members, or staff, with ties or allegiances to Lake Erie Land, NISOURCE or NIPSCO, they should excuse themselves from dealing with the mitigation issue at all.

As taxpayers and Lake County residents, we much prefer our money be invested in buying more public land in the Hobart Marsh area. Lake County is very short on public land and open space, so this land acquisition money would be money well spent. Furthermore, because they are not looking out for Lake County taxpayers, or our environment, we urge you to eliminate Lake Erie Land from your mitigation decisions and proceed with Hobart Marsh land acquisition.

Yours In Conservation,

Ray Cooper, president
Lake County Fish and Game

Cc: Congressman Peter Visclosky
Mr. Bill Maudlin, IDNR
Mr. Marty Maupin, IDEM
Colonel Mark Roncoli, US Army Corps of Engineers
Mr. Dan Gardner  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, IN 46368  

Dear Mr. Gardner,

The Cedar Lake Fish and Game Club is writing to you to express our support for the Hobart Marsh site to mitigate the Little Cal Flood Control levee project. We are aware that your group is considering the Lake Erie Land proposal and we do not believe this project is fiscally or environmentally responsible.

The Hobart Marsh area already contains forested wetland areas. The existing trees, the farmland fencrows, and the hydric soils all favor successful restoration. Members of our organization have worked with Shirley Heinze on their restoration projects and believe they are concerned, environmentally responsible group that will restore and maintain these additional lands as quality forested wetlands.

If the Lake Erie Land's project is selected, we believe the taxpayers will be fleeced. Their projected restoration costs of $40 thousand an acre are not in line with monies being spent by local environmental groups like ourselves. The local lands in the Hobart Marsh area have poor drainage and are still reasonable priced so restoration costs should be more in line with the Shirley Heinze proposal. Shirley Heinze has a proven track record of keeping restoration costs reasonable and doing a good job of restoring land.

We also have concerns with the amount of time that it is taking to come to a decision on this project. The Hobart Marsh area has been the understood mitigation area for several years and it is supported by Congressman Pete Visclosky, IDNR, IDEM, USF&WS, Shirley Heinze, the Indiana Dunes National Lake Shore, the Isaac Walton League, and local environmental groups like us. We also feel that board members with possible indirect fiscal ties to LEL should recuse themselves from participating in this decision.

Your board has the opportunity to tie together some great natural areas that our environmental groups and agencies have had the foresight to preserve. Cedar Lake Fish and Game asks you to choose the Hobart Marsh proposal to create a lasting, high quality environmental area for our local citizens.

cc: Congressman Peter Visclosky  
    Bill Maudlin, IDNR  
    Col. Mark Roncoli, COE

Sincerely,

Chris Salberg  

Chris Salberg, CLFGC Wetlands Committee
Mr. Dan Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
5100 Southport rd.
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner:

Please implement the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan without further delay. It has the backing of Representative Visclosky, DRN and IDEM and is tax-payer supported. The mitigation land should not be managed by a private company.

Implementing the Hobart Marsh plan shows financial as well as ecological responsibility on the part of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and will be an another good environmental project that would bring credit to Northwest Indiana.

Sincerely,

Beverly Overmyer
110 N. 641 W.
Valparaiso, IN 46385

cc: Congressman Visclosky, Bill Maudlin, Marty Maupin,
Col. Mark Roncoli
Red and Brown

R.I. Maritime Police

Police Report

Time: 10/4/1

Report

The incident occurred during a routine patrol. The suspect was observed entering the area and was later apprehended. Further investigation is ongoing.

More concerning

incidents and some be seen

will provide the local public for
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Dear Mr. Gardner,

Portage IN 46368

610 S. Southport Rd.

Little Calurfer River Basin Development Commission

Executive Director and Commission Chairman

Dan Gardner
To: Dan Gardner
From: Peter Wilkin <pwilkin@centaur.cc.purdue.edu>
Subject: Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan
Cc:
Bcc:
Attached:

Dan Gardner
Executive Director and Commission Chairperson
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Director Gardner

RE: Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan

I am writing in support of the Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan. I will attend the 6 PM meeting on 2/10/2001 of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, at NIPPC in Portage. The purpose of this letter is to advise your work on this plan. I am a biologist, and I belong to several conservation societies which are active locally, including Save the Dunes and the Sierra Club's Duneland Group.

First, although the mitigation plan has been developed since 1997, there has been a delay in getting underway. Delay increases land costs and decreases land choices. The West Reach half of the levee project needs permits, which require mitigation.

Second, the mitigation should not be given to the Lake Erie Land Company (LEL), because their land is unsuitable for the mitigation, and they want $11.1 million for their land, whereas Hobart Marsh may be done for $3.4 million (details are available). It is a violation of public trust and a waste of taxpayer's money to go to LEL. And commission members with ties to LEL and NIPSCO should excuse themselves from the mitigation, as it is a conflict of interest.

Third, the Hobart Marsh forested wetland is much preferable to LEL's wet prairie. The agencies: DNR, IDEM US FWS have agreed that Hobart Marsh is the best site for the mitigation, because of the great advantage that a mega-preserve has for wildlife. It is a fact that habitat fragmentation is a major cause of loss of diversity of animal and plant species.

Hobart Marsh is THE opportunity for the Little Calumet Commission to leave a significant ecological legacy to mitigate the endless damage done by development.

Please support the Hobart Marsh Mitigation Plan

Sincerely Yours,

Peter J. Wilkin

cc. Congressman Peter Visclosky,
Bill Maudlin, Indiana DNR, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Marty Maupin, Project Manager, IDEM
Colonel Mark Roncoli, District Engineer, US Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago
January 8, 2001

Mr. David Hendrix
Chairman
Little Rain

Dear Mr. Hendrix,

I would like to express my concern regarding the current plan for the construction of the Little Rain Dam.

As you are aware, the Environmental Protection Act requires careful consideration of environmental impacts. The proposed dam would have significant ecological implications, particularly for local wildlife and waterways.

I also understand that the Little Rain Dam is expected to provide a water supply for the Little Rain community. However, there is a need to balance the economic benefits with the potential environmental costs.

Please consider the following points:

1. **Environmental Impact:** A detailed environmental impact assessment should be conducted to ensure that the project complies with all necessary regulations.
2. **Alternative Solutions:** Explore alternative methods that could mitigate the environmental damage. For instance, the use of less intrusive technologies could be considered.
3. **Community Support:** Engage with the local community to ensure that their concerns are addressed.

I look forward to hearing your thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr. David Hendrix
Chairman
Little Rain
Dan Gardner  
Executive Director, and Commission Chairman  
Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, IN 46368  

Dear Chairman Gardner:  

This letter is concerning the mitigation project to restore about 300 acres of land in Hobart Marsh.  

This marsh should be restored as proposed by the Corps of Engineers’ plan to restore the original wet oak savanna habitat. This plan is supported by the US Army Corps of Engineers, DNR, IDEM, and Congressman Visclosky.  

Opposing this improvement is Lake Erie Land, a subsidiary of NIPSCO, whose interest would be economic development. This then becomes a choice between corporate profit and use of sensitive land that it is in the public interest to protect.  

Valuable natural resources such as the Hobart Marsh have been systematically destroyed in the past. Northwest Indiana needs to have some useful and unspoiled areas to point to show we are not bought out by those habituated to the profit motive.  

Richard R. Fryer  
Sierra Club  

Copies: Congressman Visclosky, Bill Maudlin, Marty Maupin, Colonel Mark Roncoli.
January 4, 2001

Dan Gardner
Exec Dir & Comm Chair
Little Calumet River Basin
6100 Southport Rd
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Chairman Gardner,

We are writing to give our full support to the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan to acquire and restore 300 acres of original wet oak savanna habitat surrounding Hobart Prairie Grove, McCloskey Savanna and Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund’s properties.

We understand that a subsidiary of NIPSCO, Lake Erie Land, is working to take the mitigation away from Hobart Marsh for the purpose of mitigation on public land that they control.

Hobart Marsh is the better choice for mitigation. The DNR, IDEM, and US FWS have all agreed that Hobart Marsh is the best site because it is the most ecologically stable site and will leave a real legacy to mitigate the damage done to wetlands and other high quality natural areas. Also, once this land is overlooked and sold to private interests, it will be gone forever. Whereas, the LEL's land is presently protected and will be available for mitigation in the future.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joaquim & John Panuzzo
2838 W. 47th Avenue
Gary, IN 46408
Dear Mr. Gardner:

I am learning about the various wetland mitigation plans in northwest Indiana. I do not know all details of the plans and sites, and I do not know much about any controversies about them. However, I do know some aspects and I have some insight into the problem that I believe is useful. This I outline below.

I gather that there are two main sites being considered: Hobart Marsh and LEL property. The reality is that wetland destruction and degradation has been so extensive that we need both projects (and more) go to completion in order to pay back even a part of what has been done in the past. But if, for now, some priority needs to be assigned, here are some thoughts I would like to share.

The clearest view I have of the natural heritage of northwest Indiana prior to our settlement is one of incredible ecological heterogeneity. For an area of our size, this was one of the most heterogeneous, and hence ecologically exciting, sites on Earth. This is especially intriguing considering that we have virtually no significant hills or mountains to create heterogeneity!

If we are ever to recapture the ecological grandeur of northwest Indiana, which I believe is a great treasure to recapture at any cost, then we should give priority to restoring and enhancing sites that offer opportunities to enhance ecological heterogeneity.

My knowledge of the two properties under consideration suggests that both Hobart Marsh and LEL property can enhance the ecological heterogeneity of northwest Indiana. Yet, I believe that Hobart Marsh should be given strong support for mitigation work. Its wetlands can be readily enhanced into a variety of different types, which is just how Mother Nature first created the ecological heritage of northwest Indiana and is the basis on which all forms of wildlife evolved and rely for their persistence. In addition, and just as important, is that Hobart Marsh offers excellent opportunity to restore diverse upland sites into a great wetland-upland complex. It is obvious that “no man is an island,” and it important to keep at the forefront that no wetland is an island.

The LEL property has a lot to offer, however, it does not offer as much ecological heterogeneity, both wetland and upland, as Hobart Marsh. That does not
mean that the LEL property should not get attention. I fully believe it, too, should get attention. However, it makes by far the best ecological sense to make sure that both Hobart Marsh and LEL property are developed. To put all our eggs at this stage into the LEL property would be turn away from the ecological knowledge that we should get back as much ecological heterogeneity as possible.

In sum, I believe that Hobart Marsh offers a great chance to enhance a diverse array of wetlands and adjacent uplands. Mother Nature will be pleased if Hobart Marsh is given strong support. She will be further pleased if we do both sites. Perhaps there are other funding opportunities, both present and future, that might allow us to do both. But for now, we cannot let the Hobart Marsh opportunity be lost.

Thanks much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Spencer Cortwright, Chair

cc: Peter Visclosky
    Bill Maudlin
    Marty Maupin
    Col. Mark Roncoli
January 3, 2001

Dan Gardner, Executive Director and Commission Chairman
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
4100 Southport Rd.
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner:

Once again I feel compelled to write regarding the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan. I regret that due to my work schedule I will be unable to attend the meeting on Jan. 10. I do not understand why there has been such a delay (going on 4 years now) in getting started on this plan. Delay only increases costs and decreases options which doesn’t make sense.

It seems that a lot of effort has been exerted to give the mitigation to Lake Erie Land. This seems very inappropriate, given that there is an obvious conflict of interest benefiting private business at unwarranted taxpayer expense. Commission members with ties to LEL and NIPSCO should NOT be involved in making this decision.

Hobart Marsh is the most fiscally and practically responsible option in this matter. Clearly it easier and more environmentally sound to restore an area than to attempt to create something new that would have doubtful long-term success. The figures that I have seen show the LEL plan at 3 times the cost of Hobart Marsh!

As a nature lover who hikes and observes wildlife in these areas frequently, the outcome of this decision is personally relevant. Our area is being so rapidly gobled up with hideous and unnecessary development, and in the process more and more of our natural areas are being disposed of just by the proximity of the development. Adopting Hobart Marsh is an opportunity for the Little Cal Commission to leave a real ecological legacy to mitigate damage already done.

I look forward to hearing that the commission will soon get started on the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan.

Sincerely,

Jane C. Fields
Dear Mr. Academy, Federal Communications Commissioner,

I am writing concerning the Telecommunications Development Corporation's (TDC) new proposal to restructure its National Mitigation Plan. TDC's plan, as currently drafted, would accomplish the objective of reducing direct expenditures on mitigation expenses by 70% over the next ten years. However, I believe that this plan is too ambitious and would not be viable in its current form.

I believe that the plan should be modified to include a more realistic estimate of the potential savings. In my view, the plan should be revised to include a more conservative estimate of the potential savings, and I would support the inclusion of additional provisions for the mitigation of the potential impact.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date]
Dan Gardner  
Little Calumet River  
Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Rd.  
Portage, In.  46368

Dear Mr. Gardner,

As the Executive Director and Commission Chairman of the  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, I am  
asking you to consider our pleas to stop delaying the  
implementation of the Hobart Marsh mitigation plan.

I am writing to support the advancement of the Hobart  
Marsh mitigation plan by the Corps of Engineers. The  
Hobart Marsh has been recognized by agencies such as the  
DNR, IDEM, and US FWS as a logical location and it is time  
to start the project.

Often, locations that have been compromised for years have  
almost insurmountable problems as a result of development  
and ensuing invasive aliens. This location is ideal,  
because success can be achieved at a nominal cost. The  
proposed Hobart Marsh is the most cost effective and  
should be started before more marginal areas are  
considered. I personally like the Hobart Marsh location  
because 306 acres would be added to the overall protected  
area and would reduce the effects of fragmentation.

Think of the work being done now in the Florida  
"Everglades". Wouldn't it be better to initiate the above  
plan rather than have to "undo" what may happen to this  
property in the future or consider the cost of the LEL  
plan? This is a time where money should be appropriated  
carefully - please consider this when deciding.

If the LEL mitigation plan is so wonderful it should be  
self-funded and not a taxpayer funded project.

Thank You,

Karen L. Sena

Karen L. Sena  
332 S. Lake Park Ave.  
Hobart, In  46342-4330
414 Wayne St.
Hobart, Indiana 46342
January 6, 2001

Dan Gardner, Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Gardner,

Re: Corps of Engineers' Mitigation Project

Why hasn't the Commission taken care of the project by restoring 300 acres of land in Hobart Marsh? This project has been dragging on since 1997! Land costs are going up; the commission is wasting taxpayers' money by delaying the acquisition of this property which has been approved by DNR, IDEM, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Congressman Visclosky's office.

Why in the world would the Commission even consider Lake Erie Land company's efforts to sell land for $11,000,000 to the Commission for this project? That's almost seven million dollars more for land that artificially will have to be restored. Hobart Marsh is already ecologically more sound and abuts land that is similar. Taxpayers can only surmise that the Commission members would stand to personally benefit from LEL if land is purchased from LEL!

Ethically, any members with ties to Lake Erie Land Company and NIPSCo should not be allowed to vote or have input on this purchase. Isn't Mark Reshkin on the payroll of those companies?

Please resolve this matter as soon as possible. We plan to be at the January 10 meeting.

Very truly yours,

Louise Karwowski & Remigius Karwowski

cc: P Visclosky.
B. Maudlin
M. Maupin
M. Roncoli

219-942-4098
WORK STUDY SESSION
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE
February 1, 2001
Bob Huffman, Committee Chairman

1. A meeting will be held at the Gary City Hall on February 6 to review preliminary plans for the Stage III Remediation contract at Grant Street and assure all existing impacts (including utilities) are addressed.
2. The Stage VII engineering review was submitted by the LCRBDC to the COE on February 2. Plans and specs presented had not addressed over 50% of our preliminary comments.
3. LCRBDC presented point of contact to the COE (VIKING ENGINEERING) for local support to rebuild pumps.
4. Bid opening for the North 5th Avenue pump station is scheduled for February 6. (This is an estimated contract cost of $3.1 million)
NOTICE

REAL ESTATE EXECUTIVE SESSION

WILL MEET AT 4:30 P.M. PROMPT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2001

AGENDA

Dale Kleszynski, appraiser who is doing the appraisal on Woodmar Country Club, will be here at 4:30 to answer questions regarding his appraisal process. We will allow ½ hour prior to the 5:00 Work Study Session. If you have an interest in this matter, please be here by 4:30 p.m.
January 15, 2001

Dale Kleszynski
Associated Property Counselors, Ltd.
3027 Ridge Road
Landing, IL 60438

RE: Woodmar County Club Appraisal

Dear Dale:

As you recall, we previously discussed your progress regarding the finalization of the Woodmar Appraisal. You had indicated to me that you felt that the retention of a golf course architect and construction specialist would be very helpful in completing your appraisal. I have passed this along to the Commission and was asked that I send you this letter requesting that you outline who you had in mind as specialists, why you needed these specialists and how much they might cost the Commission.

Please respond at your earliest convenience regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Louis M. Casale
Attorney at Law

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
    Curt Vosti, LCRBDC
January 20, 2001

Mr. Louis M. Casale
Attorney at Law
Casale, Skozen, Woodward & Buls, LLP
5201 Fountain Drive, Suite A
Crown Point, Indiana 46307

Re: Woodmar Country Club

Dear Mr. Casale:

I received your letter of January 15, 2001. In response to this correspondence I am respectfully requesting that I be allowed to attend the February meeting of the Little Calumet River Basin Commission. I understand that this meeting is to be held on February 1, 2001. It will be best to discuss the issues I am involved in during an executive session so please advise me of the correct time for the meeting. I will be prepared to address the issues you raise in the correspondence of January 15, 2001. If you have any questions please call me.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Dale J. Kleszynski, MAI, SRA
President
1.) There are no increased offers.
   There is one condemnation: DC 497  Lots 24, 25  Block 3 Georgia Gardens  Gary

2.) Handicapped Accessible Park information:
   River Forest Elementary School, the site of the proposed handicapped accessible park, had
   previously ordered about $70,000 in playground equipment from Playworld Systems, in
   anticipation of rebuilding their own park. They had paid off the invoice except for a
   $10,000 balance. When the Lake Erie Land Company and LCRBDC proposed building
   the handicapped accessible park, school officials requested we pay off that $10,000
   balance, rather than have Playworld take back the equipment. As of today LCRBDC is
   sending a check for $10,000 to Playworld and LEL has agreed to reimburse LCRBDC.
   Thanks to LEL.

3.) It is with sadness that we report the death of a long-time LCRBDC farmer and friend,
   Dale Nimetz. Mr. Nimetz farmed our lands for many years and helped with maintenance
   projects as the need arose. He was a sincerely likeable person and well-know in the Black
   Oak area. LCRBDC sends sympathies to his family.
## LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
### DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
#### ATTENDANCE ROSTER

**NAME OF MEETING:** LEBDOC  
**DATE:** 2-1-01

**LOCATION:** 6100 Southport Rd, Portage  
**CHAIRMAN:** William Tanke

### PLEASE SIGN IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION, ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Jim Flora</td>
<td>R. W. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Don Ewoldt</td>
<td>LEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Johnny Grant</td>
<td>DNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sandy O'Brien</td>
<td>Siena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Real Estate Division

SUBJECT: Mitigation Land Acquisition

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

It has been determined that the following lands are acceptable for the wetland mitigation acreage requirements. You are directed, in accordance with Article III (a) of the Local Cooperation Agreement, to secure these lands by a Right-of-Entry for Construction:

**Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund Tracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burr Oak Woods (W&amp;E)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedano</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (north)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (south)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammey Estate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLTH Radio Lot 4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLTH Radio Lot 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hobart Area Tracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohman*</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There are currently three tracts owned by the Nozik Estate which total 60 acres. The Nozik Estate has entered into negotiations to transfer these tracts to the Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund. If this transfer is completed in a timely manner than the Frohman Tract can be replaced with thee three Nozik Estate Tracts.
Attached is a map of the acquisition area highlighting suggested acquisition tracts, Authorization for Entry for Construction and Attorney’s Certificate of Authority. Please be advised that the person or organization signing the Right-of-Entry for Construction must prove fee ownership of the tract and that the tract is encumbered by a conservation easement with a reverter clause to the IDNR. Upon completion of the acquisitions please have the documents signed and dated on behalf of the Commission and return one set of documents to the Real Estate Division.

Every effort has been made to identify all the lands required for the project. However, the commission shall remain responsible for any additional interest in lands that the Government determines to be necessary for project purposes.

FOR THE COMMANDER

[Signature]
William G. White  
Chief, Real Estate Division

Attachments

Copy Furnished:  
Louis M. Casale, Esq.  
Imad Samara, PM-PM  
Greg Moore, PM-PS
AUTHORIZATION FOR ENTRY FOR CONSTRUCTION
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
FLOOD PROTECTION AND RECREATION PROJECT
Mitigation

I, Dan Gardner, Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, do hereby certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has acquired the real property interests required by the Department of the Army for the Mitigation requirements, as outlined on the attached Real estate Mapping, and otherwise is vested with sufficient title and interest in lands to support construction of this segment of the project. Further, I hereby authorize the Department of the Army, its agents, employees and contractors to enter upon said lands as identified on attached map to construct the features as set forth in the plans and specifications held in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Chicago District Office, Chicago, Illinois.

Witness my signature as Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission this ___ day of __________, 2001.

BY:

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

ATTORNEY’S CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

I, Louis M. Casale, Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, State of Indiana certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has authority to grant the above Authorization for Entry; that said Authorization for Entry is executed by the proper duly authorized officer; and that the Authorization for Entry is in sufficient form to grant the authorization therein stated.

Witness my signature as Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, this _______ day of __________, 2001.

BY:

Louis M. Casale
Chief Legal Officer
AUTHORIZATION FOR ENTRY FOR CONSTRUCTION
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
FLOOD PROTECTION AND RECREATION PROJECT
Mitigation

I, Dan Gardner, Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, do hereby certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has acquired the real property interests required by the Department of the Army for the Mitigation requirements, as outlined on the attached Real estate Mapping, and otherwise is vested with sufficient title and interest in lands to support construction of this segment of the project. Further, I hereby authorize the Department of the Army, its agents, employees and contractors to enter upon said lands as identified on attached map to construct the features as set forth in the plans and specifications held in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Chicago District Office, Chicago, Illinois.

Witness my signature as Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission this____day of ____________, 2001.

BY:________________________
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

ATTORNEY’S CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

I, Louis M. Casale, Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, State of Indiana certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has authority to grant the above Authorization for Entry; that said Authorization for Entry is executed by the proper duly authorized officer; and that the Authorization for Entry is in sufficient form to grant the authorization therein stated.

Witness my signature as Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, this _______day of ________, 2001.

BY:________________________________
Louis M. Casale
Chief Legal Officer
AUTHORIZATION FOR ENTRY FOR CONSTRUCTION
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
FLOOD PROTECTION AND RECREATION PROJECT
Mitigation

I, Dan Gardner, Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, do hereby certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has acquired the real property interests required by the Department of the Army for the Mitigation requirements, as outlined on the attached Real estate Mapping, and otherwise is vested with sufficient title and interest in lands to support construction of this segment of the project. Further, I hereby authorize the Department of the Army, its agents, employees and contractors to enter upon said lands as identified on attached map to construct the features as set forth in the plans and specifications held in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Chicago District Office, Chicago, Illinois.

Witness my signature as Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission this ______ day of ____________, 2001.

BY: ____________________________
    Dan Gardner
    Executive Director

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

I, Louis M. Casale, Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, State of Indiana Certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has authority to grant the above Authorization for Entry; that said Authorization for Entry is executed by the proper duly authorized officer; and that the Authorization for Entry is in sufficient form to grant the authorization therein stated.

Witness my signature as Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, this ______ day of ____________, 2001.

BY: ____________________________
    Louis M. Casale
    Chief Legal Officer
AUTHORIZATION FOR ENTRY FOR CONSTRUCTION  
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN  
FLOOD PROTECTION AND RECREATION PROJECT  
Mitigation

I, Dan Gardner, Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, do hereby certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has acquired the real property interests required by the Department of the Army for the Mitigation requirements, as outlined on the attached Real estate Mapping, and otherwise is vested with sufficient title and interest in lands to support construction of this segment of the project. Further, I hereby authorize the Department of the Army, its agents, employees and contractors to enter upon said lands as identified on attached map to construct the features as set forth in the plans and specifications held in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Chicago District Office, Chicago, Illinois.

Witness my signature as Executive Director, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission this ___ day of ____________, 2001.

BY: ______________________
    Dan Gardner
    Executive Director

ATTORNEY’S CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

I, Louis M. Casale, Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, State of Indiana Certify that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission has authority to grant the above Authorization for Entry; that said Authorization for Entry is executed by the proper duly authorized officer; and that the Authorization for Entry is in sufficient form to grant the authorization therein stated.

Witness my signature as Chief Legal Officer for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, this ___ day of ____________, 2001.

BY: ______________________
    Louis M. Casale
    Chief Legal Officer
February 1, 2001

Mr. Timothy J. Kroll, P.E.
Technical Advisor
Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

Re: Little Calumet River Levee
Stage VII
75% Plans

Dear Mr. Kroll:

This letter is in response to your Memorandum dated January 16, 2001 and was formulated with the assistance of James Pokrajac of the LCRBDC. The following paragraphs are numbered in accordance with your January 16, 2001 Memorandum:

1. and 3.

a. We received 75% plans, however we did not receive 75% specifications.

b. Regarding real estate issues, the real estate drawings had too many items missing or not addressed to do a proper review at this time:

(1) No coordinates were provided.

(2) There was no distinction between permanent easement, temporary easement and right-of-way lines.

(3) Until the issues listed later in this letter are adequately addressed there seems to be a high probability of significant changes in the plans and real estate drawings. In reality we do not see a way that real estate drawings can be finalized until after the construction plans are complete.

c. Should work limits be extended riverside to minimize impact to residential backyards or to allow removal of trees on the riverside of the levee.
d. Review of Sheets C-2 through C-4 indicates that the contractor's access points to the levee will be limited to the following locations from public streets: Columbia Avenue, River Drive North at the Walnut Street Pump Station, Northcote Avenue. With the limited number of access points and the very narrow work limits in many areas, is there adequate space for the contractor to efficiently perform the construction. Please explain the anticipated construction procedure the contractor will use when he is clearing and grubbing as well as excavating and sheet pile driving. (This could impact current work limits.)

2. Regarding the response to 50% BCOE review comments we have the following comments:

a. Many of the responses indicated the word "noted" with little or no further explanation. Comparison of a number of these comments with plans do not indicate that the comments have been incorporated into the plans. We believe that each comment needs a definitive answer. Some comments would result in changes in the plans and specifications if implemented. If a comment was incorporated into the plans and specs then the response should indicate that. If a comment was rejected then the response should indicate that and why. Other comments just require an explanation which should be provided as the response.

b. Review of the responses to date indicate that the following significant comments still have not been addressed:

(1) Input from Hammond and Munster regarding the change in project design concept resulting from implementing the value engineering concept. See comments 144 and 145.

(2) Problems associated with sheet pile driving. See comments 149 and 150.

(3) Potential corrosion of the sheet piling and anticipated useful life. See comments 155 and 156.

(4) Utility relocation. The response to comment 146 indicates that utilities are to pass under the SPFW. Is this adequate? Just letting these utilities pass under the SPFW does not appear to provide adequate safety to the line of protection. Note that the plans show petroleum pipelines as well as storm and combined sewer crossing the line of protection or running parallel to it.

4. Landscaping issue still are a major area of concern.

(a) Our comments 183 and 184 need to be addressed. In particular, input on landscaping still needs to be obtained from Hammond and Munster.
Mr. Timothy J. Kroll, P.E.
Corps of Engineers
February 1, 2001
Page Three

(b) The “Typical Levee Planting Scheme” on Sheet 13 shows an area labeled “Herbaceous Material Only” extending out from the levee crest to almost the toe of the levee. In areas where only the crest of the levee is being disturbed to allow for installation of sheet piling, the area labeled “Herbaceous Material Only” contains many large trees and shrubs. Is this acceptable? Will the earthen levee in this area provide adequate support for the sheet piling when these trees die and the root systems decay? Should new tree and shrub growth in these areas be controlled?

In summary we believe that the design of this section of levee should be put on hold until many of the issues listed above are addressed and resolved. Once the issues have been resolved and the plans adjusted accordingly and all 50% comments addressed, we will need to schedule a public meeting with both Hammond and Munster residents similar to the earlier meeting we had with Highland residents.

Very truly yours,


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

JJF:kf
002060.90

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
Emmett Clancy, Corps of Engineers
Chrystal Spokane, Corps of Engineers
Imad Samara, Corps of Engineers
# 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

**Total:** 1,587,147.79

# Receipts - January 1, 2000 - December 31, 2000

- Lease Rents: 51,231.29
- Interest Income: 80,592.57
- Land Acquisition: 2,635,933.08
- Escrow Account Interest: 9,766.93

**Miscellaneous Income:**
- William Tanke: 55.60
- TCCOR: 59.08
- GTE: 10.61
- TCCOR: 568.00
- City of Portage: 106.66
- Durenlen(4PHOTO): 325.00
- L. C. Treasurer: 783.00
- Community Title: 670.02
- R. W. Armstrong: 449.00
- DLZ: 2100.00
- Charles Agnew: 35.00
- Lou Casali: 100.00
- Charles Agnew: 100.00
- Bill Tanke: 100.00
- Lel Land: 2150.00
- Gary Sanitation: 1139.00

**KKHC Reimbursement & Telephone Charge:** 1,763.83

**Proceeds from Voided Checks:** 300,150.38

**Checks & Deposits:**
- Check #6014: 124,825.00
- Check #6505: 33.60
- Check #6569: 35,000.00
- Check #6572: 350.00
- Check #6615: 627.08
- Check #6616: 3,292.95
- Check #6771: 1171.75

**Total Receipts:** 3,067,458.73

# Disbursements - January 1, 2000 - December 31, 2000

**Administrative:**
- 1999 Expenses Paid in 2000: 88,437.89
- Per Diem: 10,050.00
- Legal Services: 7,065.96
- NIEPC: 117,964.14
- Travel & Mileage: 16,499.32
- Printing & Advertising: 1,013.09
- Bonds & Insurance: 5,902.63
- Telephone Expense: 9,196.01
- Meeting Expense: 9,057.00

**Land Acquisition:**
- Legal Services: 70,285.60
- Appraisal Services: 54,950.00
- Engineering Services: 84,765.02
- Land Purchase Contractual: 12,577.49
- Facilitius/Project Maintenance Services: 35,431.44
- Operations Services: 0.00
- Land Mangement Services: 171,015.69
- Surveying Services: 117,219.34
- Economic/Marketing Sources: 1,600.00
- Property & Structure Costs: 231,982.35
- Moving Allocation: 65,118.64
- Taxes: 5,984.21
- Land Purchase Contractual: 0.00
- Property & Structures Insurance: 21,546.00
- Utility Relocation Services: 60,958.61
- Land Capital Improvement: 30,049.80
- Structural Capital Improvements: 20,122.28
- Bank One (Purchased Certificate): 1,500,000.00
- Bank Calumet (Purchase Certificate Wiel FL Funds): 90,265.00

**Total Disbursements:** 2,718,990.12

# Cash Position - December 31, 2000

**Checking Account:**
- Land Acquisition: 244,026.11
- General Fund: 49,042.51

**Tax Fund:**
- Investments:
  - Bank Calumet: 316,000.00
  - Bank Calumet: 700,000.00
  - Bank One: 165,116.15
  - Bank Calumet: 92,831.76
  - Bank One: 12,258.90
  - Bank One: 123,603.70
  - Bank One: 1,247,109.75

**Total Investments:** 2,595,370.56

**Escrow Account Interest:** 21,415.77

**Total:** 2,616,785.66
LAND ACQUISITION REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, February 1, 2001

(Information in this report is from January 2, 2001 – January 29, 2001)

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.)
3. University Park Medical Center (DC-538)
   • Wrote a letter to the COE on December 29, 2000 enclosing the new location &
     topographical survey. The Med Center added approximately 2’ of fill to expand their
     parking facilities that would also raise it above the 100-year event. We requested
     eliminating this acquisition. (Awaiting response from COE as of January 26)

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 3C2) – Grant to Harrison:
1. The final inspection was made on May 18th, 2000 – completion and turnover of O&M
   manuals was done on November 21, 2000.
2. The re-location of the recreation trail due to the crossing at Grant St. would require
   agreements with the Gas City Truck Stop and the city of Gary to be able to cross Grant St. at
   the light at 32nd Ave.
   • A meeting with Gas City was held on January 23, 2001 to review their re-
     consideration to installing a trail east of their truck stop (Refer to Recreation
     Report).
   • If this is agreed upon, we will need to pursue additional acquisition for the trail.
   • This work may be done as part of the Stage III Remediation project scheduled for Spring

STATUS (Stage II, Phase 4) – Broadway to MLK Drive – North Levee:
1. Investigation into DC 517 will begin. This parcel is on project boundary line and may not be
   needed. Is an extensive relocation.

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. All easements obtained, utility re-locations completed, and construction started. Anticipated substantial completion of project is June 2001.

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 1-South) – Cline to Burr (South of the Norfolk Southern RR):
1. Bids were reviewed and Dyer Construction is the contractor. Work started on May 23rd, 2000 – 450 days to complete project (see Engineering Report).

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 2A) – Lake Etta – Burr to Clark:
1. All construction is currently completed. Pump test has been completed. (Refer to Engineering Report)

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 2B) – Clark to Chase:
1. Construction is complete. (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. We received modified real estate drawings for Tri-State Bus Terminal from the COE on November 17th, 2000. Modified legal descriptions anticipated for completion by February 5, 2001. Then, the appraisal process will begin.
2. Wicker Park appraisal is ongoing.
   • We received John Snell’s contract. He has made changes and Lou is reviewing. Mr. Snell has worked on COE projects. He is concerned COE delays will penalize his delivery time.
3. The survey for K-Mart was completed by LDZ and was presented to the COE at the December 5th Real Estate meeting.
   A. COE Engineering will consider moving the trail as far west as possible to minimize taking of parking spaces and reducing impact to tire center at southwest corner of property.
   • The COE has agreed to move the trail westward to minimize impacts and we are awaiting revised coordinates.
   B. We received a letter of request from K-Mart requesting construction and easement information on January 10.

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 3) – Northcote to Indianapolis – (Woodmar Country Club):
1. LCRBDC Board members had requested that Woodmar appraiser Dale Kleszynski report on the appraisal and his explanation for wanting to hire a golf course architect and contractor.
2. Attorney Casale sent a letter to Dale Kleszynski on January 15, 2001 requesting information regarding usage of a golf course architect and construction specialist in his appraisal.
STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 1) – Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to Liable – South of the River:
1. All initial surveys have been completed north of the river by GLE on December 15th. The appraisal process will begin in mid-February.
   - Highland properties south of the river should be completed by DLZ by early February which will be approximately 65% of acquisitions south of the river.
2. Upon field investigation by LCRBDC on January 16 and upon receiving additional property ownership information, additional field work & surveys will be required.
3. We received a location survey of newly constructed buildings by Krosan Development which were built on easements required for construction.
   - We are currently working with the COE on how to proceed.

STATUS (Stage VI – Phase 2) Liable to Cline – South of the River:
1. We received a letter from Komark Business Co. on November 17th, 2000, regarding concerns of preliminary real estate design from the COE West of Cline and South of NIPSCO R/W.
   - We received the VI-2 engineering plans & specs & submitted comments that they should minimize real estate impacts in this area and the landscaping adjacent to this area might require local coordination.
2. We are still awaiting final engineering drawings to review. These could affect the preliminary real estate work limits.

STATUS (Stage VII) – Northece to Columbia:
1. Review of real estate drawings was completed on December 8th, 2000, and drawings were found to be totally inadequate – they were based upon FDM5.
   - The COE will submit revised real estate drawings prior to 100% B COE review. (We anticipate Earthtech to complete this by mid-February)

STATUS (Stage VIII) – Columbia to State Line (Both Sides of River)
1. We received a letter from Muta Advertising on August 22nd expressing concern for future development impacts on his property that would effect his comprehensive plan.
   - This was discussed at the Nov. 1 Technical Review Meeting and it was agreed to have a meeting with him after the COE completes hydrology review in this area. (Ongoing)

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) E.J. & F. Railroad to, and including, Colfax North of the NIPSCO R/W – Ditch is South of NIPSCO R/W from Arbogast to Colfax.
1. Construction started on July 28 (Refer to Engineering Report for details)

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 July 2001; award contract by September 2001; and a construction start of October 2001 – 360 days to complete. (14 acquisitions remaining.)

EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA – (NORTH OF I-80/94, MLK TO I-65):
1. COE has reviewed and approved all remaining appraisals. Offers to landowners will go out in next few months (27 parcels remaining).
WEST REACH PUMP STATIONS – PHASE 1A
1. These stations include Baring, Hohman-Munster, Walnut and South Kennedy.
2. Refer to Engineering Report.

WEST REACH PUMP STATIONS – PHASE 1B
1. These stations include 81st Street (Highland) and S.E. Hessville (Hammond)
2. Refer to Engineering Report.

MITIGATION
1. The Cline Avenue construction project has resulted in increased water on the 69 acre site between Cline Avenue and Liable Road.
   • We received a copy of a letter from the COE to the IDNR dated January 16, 2001 which formally eliminates this area from the Little Calumet River mitigation plan.
January 10, 2001

Ms. Judith Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

RE: Appraisal Contract
Wicker Memorial Park Golf Course
North Township, Lake County, Indiana

Dear Judy:

Enclosed is the executed Contract Agreement For Appraisal Reports on the Wicker Memorial Park Golf Course property. As we discussed, I made some clarifications to paragraph 1. (c) relative to appraisal review supplements, and to Schedule A 1.) relative to the delivery date of the report. Please have the Contract countersigned and return a copy to me along with the retainer so that I may begin to schedule the assignment. Once you have assembled the property and project information requested in my November letter and, during our discussions, we can agree on a mutually acceptable target delivery date.

Dale Kleszynski has been in touch with me this week regarding his request for consulting input from both a golf course architect and contractor relative to Woodmar Country Club. While the Wicker Park appraisal does not appear to demand this additional outside consulting, if you determine that it is appropriate for Woodmar CC, some joint benefit may also be available to the Wicker Park assignment. In the meantime, he reiterated his belief that we would both benefit from a sharing of market data, while clearly coming to independent conclusions. Once I am under contract, we should explore this further.

I look forward to working with you and will schedule my detailed property inspection following your confirmation of the appraisal assignment.

Best regards,

John C. Snell, MAI
CONTRACT AGREEMENT FOR APPRAISAL REPORTS

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND RECREATION PROJECT
LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA

This Contract Agreement is made and entered into this 11th day of January, 2000 by and between the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and John Snell, MAI of Real Estate Evaluation Co., Inc., hereinafter called the Contractor, located at 8425 Keystone Crossing Suite 288, Indianapolis, IN 46240.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the Commission has entered into a Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) with the United States of America (government) under which a civil works project will be constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) in cooperation with the Commission; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the LCA it is the responsibility of the Commission to obtain appraisals for all interests in real property required for the project, and it is the responsibility of the COE to review said appraisals; and

WHEREAS, the Contractor has been retained for the purpose of furnishing to the Commission appraisal reports covering the real property described in this Contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties mutually agree as follows:

1. Preparation and Review of Appraisal Reports -

   a. The Contractor shall prepare, furnish and deliver to the Commission appraisal reports covering the tracts of real property described in "Schedule A" attached to this Contract.

   b. In accordance with Public Law 91-646, as amended, the Contractor shall contact the owner and give the owner, or his designated representative, an opportunity to accompany the appraiser during the inspection of the owner's property.

   c. After the appraisal report is delivered to the Commission, it will be reviewed by a COE Review Appraiser. If requested by the Review Appraiser, the Contractor shall discuss the appraisal reports with the Review Appraiser, clarify or supplement any appraisal reports as necessary, and shall cooperate with the review process. Any discussions, clarifications, and supplements required by the review process shall be performed by the Contractor at no additional cost to the Commission, unless they are caused by changes in the project plans. Supplements requested to conform to "Uniform Appraisal Standards of Federal Land Acquisitions" or "USPAP" will be provided as requested as part of the appraisal review process, without additional cost. However, supplements to the appraisal which expand the scope of work as contracted herein, will result in additional billing at a rate of $150 per hour.
2. **Contents of Appraisal Reports -**

   a. The appraisal reports shall be narrative. The preparation, documentation and reporting shall conform to the all applicable requirements contained in the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition" dated 1992 and in compliance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) as promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation and regulations contained in CFR, Part 24, entitled "Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Regulations of Federal and Federally Assisted Programs." The appraisals shall be based on state rules for compensation.

   b. The reports shall be in an 8½" by 11" format.

   c. The contractor shall furnish three (3) originals of each report to the Commission.

   d. The appraisal report shall be organized as set forth in "Section B" of the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions." The appraisal report shall contain all of the items set forth in "Section B," unless inclusion is inappropriate, inapplicable, or impossible, and the report so indicates.

   e. For lands valued at $5,000 or less, the appraisal report may consist of a brief narrative report of four (4) pages, or less, and containing at least three (3) comparable sales.

3. **Delivery -** Time being of the essence, the contractor shall deliver to the Commission all the completed reports on the following schedule:

   Delivery on or before Schedule "A". Failure to deliver appraisal reports to the Commission on or before the above date shall result in a deduction of 1% of the total payment for each business day the reports are late unless the Commission chooses, at its sole option, to declare this Agreement terminated pursuant to Paragraph No. 6 for failure to provide said reports on a timely basis, in which event the Commission shall be liable for only reports received prior to termination and found acceptable by the COE.

4. **Testimony at Judicial Proceedings -** At the request of the Commission, the contractor agrees to testify as to the value of the property at any judicial proceeding, including pre-trial conferences and trials.

5. **Payment -** Upon performance of the obligations under this contract, the contractor agrees to make the appraisal(s) for a total consideration of $15,000.00 (see assignment sheet), however, minus deductions for late delivery of appraisal reports as provided
in Paragraph No. 3 herein. This shall constitute full payment to the contractor and shall include the costs of all supplies, material and equipment, including all discussions, clarifications, and supplements required by the COE Review Appraiser, and all other expenses incurred by the contractor in performance of this contract. The contractor shall present to the Commission an invoice and purchase order claim form for payment. Payment shall be subject to the completion of review and acceptance by the COE Review Appraiser and approval of the invoice and purchase order claim form by the Commission.

a. For testimony in judicial proceedings and attendance at pre-trial conferences the contractor shall be paid $75.00 per hour.

b. For appraisal revisions caused by changes in plats, descriptions, or estates, or for updating reports when requested, the contractor shall be paid the agreed upon hourly rate.

6. Termination
   a. If the contractor does not perform pursuant to this contract, and specifically if the contractor fails to deliver completed appraisal reports on the schedule set forth in Paragraph 3 above, the Commission may terminate this contract upon written notice to the contractor. If this contract, is terminated pursuant to this section, the contractor shall be due payment only for those appraisal reports which were received by the Commission before the contractor receives said notice and were found to be acceptable by the COE Review Appraiser.

   b. The Commission may terminate this contract for its convenience at any time by written notice to the contractor. Unless the notice directs otherwise, the contractor shall immediately after receipt of notice discontinue all work and services. If the contract is terminated pursuant to this section, the Commission will pay the contractor for all work done by the contractor which is turned over to the Commission.

7. Changes - The Commission may at any time, by a written order, make any changes within the general scope of this contract which may either increase or decrease the work and services hereunder. If such change causes an increase or decrease in the cost or the time required for performance of this contract, an equitable adjustment shall be made and the contract shall be modified in writing accordingly.

8. Confidentiality - All information contained in the appraisal reports shall be strictly confidential. The contractor shall not divulge any information concerning such appraisal reports to any person other than authorized representatives of the Commission and the COE.

9. Federal and State Laws - The contractor agrees to comply with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including section 601 of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-352) and the Department of Defense Directive 5500.11 issued pursuant thereto and published in Part 300 of Title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as well as
Army Regulation 600-7, entitled "Nondiscrimination of the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Assisted or Conducted by the Department of the Army."

10. Officials not to Benefit - No member of or delegate to the Congress, or resident commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this Contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom.

11. Covenant against Contingent Fees - The contractor warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this Agreement upon agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the Commission for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty, the Commission shall have the right to annul this Contract without liability, or in its discretion, to add to the Contract, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

APPRAISER

[Signature]

Appraiser Signature

Date: 1-11-01

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

[Signature]

Executive Director

Date: 1-25-01

Appraiser Certification

Date: 1-11-01
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

SCHEDULE "A"
APPRAISAL SCOPE OF WORK
ASSIGNED: _______________________

Assignment:

Wicker Park Memorial Golf Course Appraisal

1.) Before and After Self-Contained Narrative Appraisal
delivery with 60 days from the date of this contract. **

2.) Title work, assessment and tax card, floodplain maps, contact persons, financial
information, equipment information, all necessary documentation, etc. to be forwarded later.

** Delivery of the appraisal will be provided within 60 days after receipt
by the Appraiser of the required property documentation and retainer to
initiate the assignment. Any delays in submitting requested property or
project data to the Appraiser will correspondingly extend the delivery
date of the appraisal and will not result in any payment deduction as set
forth in Paragraph 3 of the Contract.
January 10, 2001

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

RE: Kmart #4148 - Hammond, IN
7925 Indianapolis Blvd
Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project

Dear Mr. Gardner:

I am writing in response to your November 1, 2000, Public Hearing Notice in which you indicate your desire to purchase land for an easement. As you are aware, we do not own the center but are a tenant with consent rights. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving construction drawings indicating the proposed easement so that we may determine the affect, if any, on our operation.

By copy of this letter, I am forwarding the Notice to our landlord, Hammond Acreage Partners, as the property owner would actually have to grant the easement. For your reference, Hammond Acreage Partners can be contacted c/o Spatz Centers, Inc., 330 Melvin Drive, Northbrook, IL 60062.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Briskey
Real Estate Department

cc: Hammond Acreage Partners

1445
18 January 2001

Ms. Patricia A. Briskey
Kmart Corporation Resource Center
3100 West Big Beaver Road
Tracy, MI 48084-3163

RE: Easements on the Hammond Kmart facility for the Little Calumet River Flood and Recreation Project

Dear Ms. Briskey:

Thank you for your acknowledgement letter of 10 January 2001 about the Little Calumet River Flood and Recreation Project. We understand you are the tenet of owner Hammond Acreage Partners and we have been in contact with Mr. Bill Spatz at Spatz Centers about impacts to the land.

In answer to your questions about the impacts to your Hammond facility:

1.) Easements will be needed on the south and southwest sides for levee construction, temporary work areas, and a recreation trail.
2.) There is no impact to the Kmart structure.
3.) The Army Corps of Engineers is currently reviewing the engineering drawings to eliminate any impact to the tire center and minimize the impact to parking areas.

I will mail you a set of final drawings when they are available and invite you to call me at 219-763-0696 with any further questions you may have.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
January 15, 2001

Dale Kleszynski
Associated Property Counselors, Ltd.
3027 Ridge Road
Landing, IL 60438

RE: Woodmar County Club Appraisal

Dear Dale:

As you recall, we previously discussed your progress regarding the finalization of the Woodmar Appraisal. You had indicated to me that you felt that the retention of a golf course architect and construction specialist would be very helpful in completing your appraisal. I have passed this along to the Commission and was asked that I send you this letter requesting that you outline who you had in mind as specialists, why you needed these specialists and how much they might cost the Commission.

Please respond at your earliest convenience regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Louis M. Casale
Attorney at Law

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
    Curt Vosti, LCRBDC
January 20, 2001

Mr. Louis M. Casale
Attorney at Law
Casale, Skozen, Woodward & Buls, LLP
5201 Fountain Drive, Suite A
Crown Point, Indiana 46307

Re: Woodmar Country Club

Dear Mr. Casale:

I received your letter of January 15, 2001. In response to this correspondence I am respectfully requesting that I be allowed to attend the February meeting of the Little Calumet River Basin Commission. I understand that this meeting is to be held on February 1, 2001. It will be best to discuss the issues I am involved in during an executive session so please advise me of the correct time for the meeting. I will be prepared to address the issues you raise in the correspondence of January 15, 2001. If you have any questions please call me.

Very truly yours,

Dale J. Kleczynski

Dale J. Kleczynski, MAI, SRA
President
Environmental and
Social Analysis Branch

Mr. Bill Maudlin
Environmental Supervisor
Division of Fish and Wildlife
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
402 West Washington Street, Room W-273
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

RE: Elimination of the Liable/Cline enhancement area from the Little Calumet River mitigation plan.

Dear Bill,

This letter is to inform you that we have formally eliminated the Liable/Cline enhancement area from the Little Calumet River mitigation plan. As you know, several impacts have occurred recently, and still others are anticipated, that serve to make the area unsuitable for mitigation. These impacts include:

- a recently constructed frontage road running north and south along the west side of Cline Avenue that diverts significant amounts of silt laden runoff into the Liable/Cline area.

- the relocation of the east-west running portion of the Liable/Cline levee at the south end of the site from the south side to the north side of the NIPSCO right-of-way through the most valuable portion of the area for mitigation. This relocation is necessary because a newly constructed housing development leaves too little room for a levee between the right-of-way and the nearest homes.

- three 36-inch diameter pipes and gatewells to be placed through the east-west levee segment approximately midway between Liable Street and Cline Avenue for the purpose of carrying interior drainage to the river. The low quality, high velocity water flowing from these pipes will further impact the Liable/Cline area beyond the limits of the levee itself.
These impacts have combined to significantly increase water levels and reduce water and vegetation quality within the area. The relatively higher quality portion that had made the site suitable for enhancement in the first place has already been severely degraded so that the area can no longer be considered for mitigation. That higher quality portion will be completely gone once the levees and gatewell structures are built. Any part of our mitigation obligation that we cannot accomplish within the project area will be done at Hobart Marsh.

In an e-mail dated 14 June 2000 that we received from Ms. Jomary Crary of the IN-DNR Division of Water, she states that our mitigation obligation is met without the Liable/Cline and 29th & Hanley enhancement areas. The following table, which shows what we believe to be our current mitigation obligation, includes the 29th and Hanley enhancement area because we are still trying to acquire it. If we are unable to acquire it, we will delete it from the table. If it turns out that we can get it, we will reduce Hobart area acquisition by the appropriate number of acres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: LITTLE CALUMET RIVER MITIGATION AREAS AND THEIR ACREAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Acres Available by Habitat Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (by street)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Chase (Bik. Oak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Chase (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th &amp; Hanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Subtotals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Acreage Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: DFW = Deciduous forested wetland
WP-WMP = Wet prairie-Wet-mesic prairie

Please call Greg Moore of my staff at 312/353-6400 ext. 2019 if you have questions about the above table, or if you have any questions at all. Thank you once again for all of the help you have given us on this project.

Sincerely,

Philip R. Bernstein
Chief, Planning
LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, February 1, 2001

(Information in this report is from January 2, 2001 – January 29, 2001)

NON-PROJECT LAND MANAGEMENT

A. Handicapped-Accessible Park
   1. LCRBDC has agreed with LEL to pay off the $10,000 existing balance on playground equipment ordered previously at River Forest School. LEL still must write letter to LCRBDC saying LCRBDC will be reimbursed.

B. Chase Street to Grant Street land management issues
   1. LCRBDC confirmed that we own the land (Don Ewen parcel DC83), and have an easement agreement with INDOT for the property necessary to construct a new pump station west of Grant and south of the Little Calumet River.
   - Awaiting final engineering drawings and real estate coordinates to confirm.

PROJECT RELATED LAND MANAGEMENT

A. O&M (Project manual review/accepting completed segments)
   1. It is anticipated to start accepting levee segments (after inspections are completed and found acceptable) as early as April 2001.
   2. The LCRBDC agreed that we would initially inspect and accept the projects on an individual basis to relieve the contractor of his obligations. However, we will require a procedure to mutually sign off with the COE to accept O & M responsibility.

B. Mitigation (entire project area)
   1. The funding crisis has made mitigation a top priority. The matrix makes recommendations on acquisitions in Hobart Marsh. Commissioners need to discuss situation and possibly set up a meeting with Shirley Heinze Foundation to start the acquisition procedure.

C. Emergency Management
   1. A coordination meeting was held with the COE, Lake County Emergency Management, the USGS, and representatives from Hammond and Gary on June 27th, 2000 to review new monitoring software and provide technical training.
   2. It is our intent to update the current computer equipment for the city of Hammond and to install the new equipment for monitoring for Gary at the Gary Sanitary District no later than Spring, 2001.
   - It is our understanding that the GSD will expect compensation for monitoring river levels as part of the emergency response participation plan.
• We will be approaching the city of Gary to discuss not only this situation, but overall participation by the city of Gary and GSD to help with O&M responsibilities early in 2001.
3. LCRBDC has reviewed COE mapping which shows locations of road closings, sandbagging, and emergency response locations. A plan to coordinate each community flood event response needs to be formulated.
• LCRBDC will break this down by community and then have a coordination meeting.

D. Lake Erie Land Company
1. Northwest Indiana River Corridor Partnership is still working on a map of mitigation areas. No meeting in January 2001.

E. A meeting was held with Ed Marcin of the Lamar Advertising Company (formerly WHITECO) on January 28, 2000 to review turnover of WHITECO signs to LAMAR Advertising.
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. LAMAR agreed to complete this by May, 2000. (Ongoing)
  • Closings on two properties with billboard signs (DC707, DC816) are being scheduled for February. The leases are ready.
  • We told LAMAR that they have had all year to finalize old lease revisions & complete calculations for the balance payoff & we would not agree to the new leases until this was completed.

F. Gary Sanitary District (White River Environmental Partners (WREP)) O&M
1. A field meeting was held with Dean Button (WREP) on August 24th to review security for all (4) east reach pump stations. The LCRBDC has agreed to install fencing and locks as necessary to secure the stations and their equipment.
  • Agreements were signed with the Hammond Fence Company for $5,000 to provide security for the Broadway, Burr and Grant Streets pump stations.
  • Work scheduled to start on January 3, 2001 and be completed by January 17, 2001. (Delayed due to weather)

General:
1. We currently have $58,750 in annual leases and anticipate three (3) additional signs in 2001 for an additional total that could be $10,000, for a new total of $68,750 annually. (2 in the ERR and 1 at 29th & Hanley). The new sign leases are at an increased value.
RESULTS OF REAL ESTATE MEETING HELD 22 JANUARY 2001
ARMY CORPS & LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

IN ATTENDANCE:

LCRBDC
- Dan Gardner
- Lou Casale
- Sandy Mordus
- Jim Pokrajac
- Angie Ogrentz
- Judy Vamos
- Lorraine Kray

COE
- Bill White
- Imad Samara
- Emmett Clancy
- Chris Borton
- Chrystal Spokane (new Realty Specialist)

Emmett Clancy, Chief of Acquisitions, will be leaving the Corps around 28 February 2001. LCRBDC wishes Emmett well in his new position in the Air Force. LCRBDC contact will be Chrystal Spokane, Realty Specialist, taking over Emmett’s duties.

1. ACQUISITIONS PRIORITIES!
This is the number one item on the agenda. Once again budgeting is the problem. Discussion centered on which stages/phases are most critical. Dan reported that LCRBDC asked for $12 million and is in the Governor’s budget for $3 million. Another $1.5 million is available in the Build Indiana Fund. These monies are to last the LCRBDC until the next biennium beginning June 2003. According to Dan, "This does not mean the state will pass these amounts." LCRBDC will still have to speak with legislators to vote for these funds and there still may be potential to get additional funds through the Build Indiana Fund. Dan and LCRBDC Commission members have visited the editorial boards of Northwest Indiana's two local newspapers, The Times and Post Tribune, with successful results. Both papers have promised favorable publicity.

Imad reported that he had a discussion with COE Deputy Colonel John Searles. Searles wants the flood project to keep moving forward no matter what. Congressman Visclosky wrote a note to the COE stating "Don't slow down, spend down" and those at the COE level agree. Imad thinks that depleting the LCRBDC bank account may be the only way to dramatize the serious situation we're facing. Within two months Imad will send a request for $725,000 to go into escrow for Burr Street Betterment Levee pump stations and construction contracts. LCRBDC has $1.3 million available now and until August 2001. The figures calculate as follows:

AVAILABLE: $1,300,000 available
EXPENDITURES:
- $725,000 COE request for $480,000 Burr St. Levee construction for $245,000 pump stations 1A, 1B, N5th
- $272,000 already committed for land acquisition
- $454,607 already committed utility relocates
- $? admin, legal, acquisition, engineering, etc. costs

A funding crisis is imminent.
It was agreed that mitigation, the Burr Street Levee, and Woodmar are the three main priorities. The following are highlights of discussion and suggested solutions:

Mitigation – Dan reported that the "Discussion is over." The funding crisis has created a need to contact the Shirley Hinz Foundation now. They had offered some acreage in the Hobart Marsh area before with an LCRBDC advance payment of $500,000 + to purchase more acres. Purchase prices should be watched and LCRBDC may need to approve, even help, with negotiations. Dan mentioned other programs that may be available on the state level whereby environmental groups could donate land for mitigation. These avenues are worth investigating. LCRBDC will discuss this with their commissioners and then set up a meeting with Shirley Hinz as first step. (ACTION: LCRBDC)

Burr Street Betterment Levee – Land Acquisition must continue and Burr Street Betterment Levee construction is a big-ticket item. Dan reported that Mayor King wants Gary to come out of the floodplain. At this point Burr Street is critical for that to happen. Dan suggested possible meetings with Gary to ask for financial aid, their financial help, to finish construction of the Burr Street Levee. (ACTION: LCRBDC)

Woodmar Country Club – This is another possible big-ticket acquisition and all indications from Woodmar, their letters and conversations, is that they are suffering financially from the flood project, now in terms of decreased membership and in the future from a probable two-year construction and grass growing shut-down. Dan suggested that an outside party or agency may be interested in acquiring the club after the flood control improvements have been completed. Perhaps bringing a third party into the negotiations might be helpful. We'll meet with our commissioners to get their feelings. COE, however, feels the club will be adequately compensated for the land and damages done to the club and that is all that should be offered. Judy mentioned that Dale has spoken with a golf course construction expert and would like to also bring in a golf course architect. Dale will be meeting with the LCRBDC commissioners at the February meeting to explain his position. (ACTION: LCRBDC)

2. STATUS OF V-2 new deadline April 02

Judy reported that John Snell has just returned his contract for Wicker with a few minor changes. She will send to Lou for his review. In his cover letter Mr. Snell agrees with Dale Kleszynski that a golf course architect and construction expert might be helpful in looking at the impacts of the levee on both clubs. (ACTION: Judy and Lou/LCRBDC)
Dale will be sending the first V-2 appraisals around the second week of February. He'll meet with Judy and Jim and receive the next assignment. Jim is concerned about the utility relocations in V-2. The area east of the E. J. & E. Railroad on the NIPSCO corridor could run $350,000 to $400,000 and the directional bores for the Phillips Pipeline west of the railroad could be another $400,000. These re-locates could be another $750,000.
(ACTION: Judy and Jim/LCRBDC)

3.) STATUS OF V-3 new deadline April 02 (Woodmar and extra lots)
   a. See preceding funding discussion.
   b. Additional lots along the abandoned railroad R/W adjacent to Indianapolis Boulevard need to be acquired. Also Imad said he'll investigate the hydrology with Jim Mazanec at the COE regarding the possibility of doing V-2 or VI-1 before V-3. He'll send a letter to LCRBDC.
   (ACTION: Imad/COE)

4.) STATUS OF VI-1 new deadline April 02
   Jim explained the problem with DC 1014/1015. Krosen Development in the Kennedy Industrial Park has built their new development (2 buildings) in the levee line. Krosen went to Hammond Planning to approve their drawings, and because the LCRBDC flood control project was not part of the regulation zoning code, and LCRBDC had no easement on the property as yet, Hammond had to grant the building approval. COE will look at the drawings again to see if the levee work limits can be moved and Lou will contact LCRBDC Commissioner Bill Tanke for his input. Mr. Tanke was instrumental in having the state make the Little Calumet River a Regulated drain with an automatic 75 ft. easement.
   (ACTION: COE and Lou/LCRBDC)

5.) STATUS OF VI-2
   Engineering and real estate issues are still being addressed by Rani Engineering.
   (ACTION: COE)

6.) STATUS OF VIII
   Emmett reported that the AE for this stage, Earth Tech, still has very bad mapping. COE is working on it. Also Emmett asked Judy to investigate at the government center if the old levees built by the city in landowners' back yards show city easements on the tax cards. If city easements are recorded on the property, LCRBDC can get an easement on the city easement and save time in acquisition. Judy is going to the government center this week.
   (ACTION: COE and Judy/LCRBDC)
7.) OTHER ISSUES

a. McClosky letter – Dan reported that environmental activist Terry McClosky on 1/17/01 presented to LCRBDC a list of documents he would like to copy and review. Six items were listed and Mr. McClosky returned on 1/18/01 to collect from LCRBDC:

1. Yearly budget requests and legislature appropriations since project start.
2. State's total cost of project to date.
3. Agreement (and responsibilities) between the Commission and Corps.

Dan directed him to obtain the following from the Corps of Engineers:

4. Army Corps total project cost to date.
5. Army Corps request for project authorization and cost to benefit ratio.
6. Current project description as approved by Congress.

b. Crediting problem – Crediting Technician Lorraine Kray reported that she has recently sent in a crediting packet with a 1989 appraisal. The COE has questioned the validity of the land value and requested a new appraisal. She explained that the Northwest Indiana MLS (Multiple Listing Service) holds "sold" comparables for only seven years. It's difficult, if not downright impossible to obtain 1989 information. The MLS goes back only to 1994. Sandy said that if the appraiser at that time was approved by the COE then the COE should accept his appraisal. Chris said he will speak with Bill White and treat each as an individual case, so as not to set a precedent. (ACTION: Chris/COE)

8. NEXT MEETING

A meeting date was not scheduled.

JV 1/23/01
PROJECT ENGINEERING
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, February 1, 2001

(Information in this report is from January 2, 2001 – January 29, 2001)

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. A final inspection with the LCRBDC and the COE will be scheduled for this entire portion of the project, including the pump station, no later than spring of 2001.

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3C2) Grant to Harrison: (8A contract)
1. The final inspection, and punch list items have been completed. We received a letter from the COE on November 22nd, 2000, indicating Webb Construction has completed this work in accordance with the provisions of the plans and specs.
   • Currently, $3,915,178.36 has been spent on this project.
   • Overrun (over original bid) $463,196
   • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $189,875
STATUS (Stage II Phase 4) Broadway to MLK Drive – North Levee:
1. Project is approx. 98% completed. (All work is completed except for the pump station.)
   • Overrun (over original bid) $1,096,378
   • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $11,070
   • Current money spent to date is $4,175,000
2. A final inspection will be scheduled with the LCRBDC and the COE for this entire project, including the Ironwood stormwater pumping station, no later than spring of 2001.

STATUS (Stage III) Chase to Grant Street:
   Kiewit Construction – Contract price $6,564,520.
2. STAGE III DRAINAGE REMEDIATION PLAN.
   A. A coordination meeting was held on November 16th, 2000, with the COE, GSD and LCRBDC to review the Grant St. construction project.
      1. The COE has agreed to engineer and design the stormwater pump station West of Grant and South of the line of protection.
         • N.W. Engineering sent a letter to INDOT on December 13, 2000 clarifying the scope of work of this project, and completion of drawing review by February 11, 2001.
      • A meeting is scheduled on February 6th at the Gary City Engineers Office to coordinate a utility field check.
   B. Technical review meeting discussed remediation plan on November 1st, 2000.
      • COE estimates approx. $1 million to do this work. $800,000 for ditches and pumps, $50,000 to engineer $18,500 GPM pump station West of Grant St. & Remainder toward work with the City of Gary.
   C. Additional work in the East Reach that would serve as “clean-up” work may be included in this contract.
      • A letter was written to the COE on December 28th addressing the paving of ramps, recreation trail tie-ins, gates & bollards, and signage.

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. (Project currently approx. 90% complete.) Projected completion in Spring 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.
      • Extras on contract - $292,771.00
      • Balance (to pay) - $1,608,719.00
STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 — South) (South of the N.S. RR.)
1. 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
   A. 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.
   B. Overall construction is approx. 60% complete, approx. 90% of the clay is placed, sheet piling is approx. 70% completed. Colfax to Calhoun Streets piling is approx. 85% complete.
2. 450 days to complete (hopeful September 2001 completion of landscaping.)
3. We received a cost estimate from the EJ & E RR on July 8th, 2000, in the amount of $22,758. (This is anticipated to be done in the spring 2001)
   • We are awaiting a cost estimate from the N.S.RR to do the work on their adjacent spur, and a letter of authorization allowing the EJ&E to do the work with their labor.

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 2A) Burr to Clark – Lake Etta:
1. Dyer Construction-95% complete.
   A. Currently, $3,477,249.66 has been spent on this project.
      • Overrun (over original bid) $183,281.00
      • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $197,137.00
2. The North Burr Street stormwater pumping station has been completed.
   A. 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 done as an addendum to the contract with Dyer Construction sub-contracting the work. Anticipated start spring of 2001; anticipated completion summer of 2001.
3. A final inspection will be scheduled with the LCRBDC and the COE for this entire project, including the pump station in spring of 2001.

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 2001. A final inspection will be held approximately mid-June with the LCRBDC prior to turnover.
2. Project money status:
   • $1,938,358 has been spent.
   • Overrun (over original bid) $408,000
   • Balance (to be paid to contractor) $155,980

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. The bid opening was held on May 9th, 2000
   • The low bidder is Dyer Construction.
   • Government estimate is $2,108,500 and Dyer bid $2,078,523.
2. Overall construction is approx. 65% complete, and the overall construction is expected to be completed in August 2001.
   - The clay base plate is installed and approx. 90% overall of the clay is placed.
   - Colfax Road raise is scheduled to start in the spring of 2001. Material is currently being stockpiled adjacent to that area.
   - The cutoff wall for the EJ&E embankment started in mid-October and is completed on both sides. Cutoff work has been done on the Griffith side. Earthwork on both sides is scheduled for the Spring of 2001.

3. We received a copy of a letter from the engineering firm representing Richard Kortenhoven to the DNR dated January 16, 2001 requesting a permit to install a culvert west of the EJ&E RR.
   - A meeting will be scheduled with the COE, DYER CONSTRUCTION, and Griffith to discuss impacts to our contract no later than mid-February.

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 complete 50% engineering by March of 2001; award contract by July 2001; and a construction start of September 2001 – 360 days to complete.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 1) Wicker Park Manor:
1. Project completed on September 14, 1995.
   Dyer Construction – Contract price $998,630
2. Phillips Pipeline directional bore under the existing levee is currently being engineered by Phillips. Awaiting their design and cost by April, 2001.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 2):  
1. At the June 7th, 2000 partnering meeting, the current schedule shows a March 2002 advertising date.
2. A letter was sent to the COE on June 21st enclosing the location survey work for the Tri-State bus terminal. Asked for engineering re-considerations for the location of the I-wall.
   - We received modified real estate requirements due to engineering revisions in December 2000 and will have modified legal by mid-February.
3. A utility coordination meeting was held on November 16th, 2000 with all pipelines, utilities, etc. that will be impacted in the NIPSCO corridor West of Kennedy Ave.
   A. LCRBDC submitted comments on meeting minutes and recommendations for coordination on November 28th and 29th, 2000.
   B. Sent email to the COE on November 21st, 2000, confirming necessity of locating the pipes in this corridor (should have been done by Stanley Assoc. (COE P/E for this project.)
   - We received a letter of request from the COE on January 23, 2001 requesting that the LCRBDC coordinate with a company to locate the depths and locations of all pipelines in this corridor.
STATUS (Stage V Phase 3) Woodmar Country Club:
1. Refer to Land Acquisition report for status of appraisal process and revised schedule.
   - As per our June 7th, 2000 partnering meeting, the schedule shows a March 2002 advertising date.
2. 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. A utility coordination meeting was held with the Town of Highland and City of Hammond on September 12th, 2000, to update original Stage VI – plans from 1996 and gather information on new or proposed utilities.
2. Legal descriptions North of the river have been completed by GLE, and legals South of the river have been completed by DLZ.
   - Some modifications to real estate are ongoing (Refer to Land Acquisition Report)

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. 50% plans and specs, and real estate drawings were submitted to LCRBDC & town of Highland for comments on December 6th (letter dated November 21, 2000)
3. We received a letter from INDOT to Rani Engineering on January 8, 2001 indicating their concerns regarding culverts & recreational proposals.

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 final value engineering review was done by the LCRBDC and sent to the COE on July 25th, 2000. These concerns have been addressed and have been implemented into their 50% BCOE plans.
3. 50% BCOE review was completed by the LCRBDC on December 4th, 2000, and submitted to the COE. This includes requests from Dr. Mark Reshkin regarding impacts adjacent to driving sheet piling. (A more detailed breakdown is available upon request.)
4. We received a request for a 75% review from the COE on January 16, 2001 along with their comments and responses to our 50% review.
   - A typical page of these responses shows that many of the questions or concerns we had were addressed by “Noted”.
   - We are responding to their review request and will point this out as unacceptable.
5. A public meeting will be scheduled with both communities around the middle of January. (This will be after the 50% BCOE review process).

STATUS (Stage VIII) Columbia to the Illinois State Line:
1. The A/E award was given to S.E.H. (Short, Elliot & Henderson Inc.)
2. A utility coordination meeting was held with Munster and Hammond on October 11th, 2000, and with the affected utility companies on October 12th, 2000.
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 September 30, 2000.
2. Contract price - $1,657,913
   Extras - $145,483
   Balance (to be paid to contractor) - $287,950
3. The entire project is completed with the exception of minor gate and sign installations. Anticipated inspection should be scheduled for spring of 2001.

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). Notice to proceed issued November 7th, 2000 – 700 days to complete – October 2002.
   A. Overstreet Construction was awarded the contract at the higher amount based upon a court decision. (They are from Florida.)
   B. A pre-construction meeting was held on November 27th, 2000, to discuss scheduling, establish points of contact, and coordination.

West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1B:
1. The Two (2) pump stations included in this contract are S.E. Hessville (Hammond), and 81st Street (Highland).
2. The current COE schedule, as per our January 26th, 2000 coordination meeting, is to start construction by late September – 350 days to complete.
   • Pumps have been ordered and are expected for delivery in the late spring of 2001.
3. Thieneman Construction (from Griffith, IN) was the successful bidder.
   • The government estimate was $2,092,000
      The low bid was $1,963,400, which was under estimated by $128,600
4. We received a status report from the COE for S.E. Hessville and 81st Street on January 23, 2001.

West Reach Pump Stations – General
1. We received an e-mail from the COE on January 2, 2001 with a breakdown of pump disposal for each project (who keeps the existing pumps after removal- the contractor or the community).
   • LCRBDC provided information to the COE regarding local companies providing pump re-building capability. COE forwarded this to their contractors.
North Fifth Avenue Pump Station:

1. The Town of Highland submitted a letter to the COE dated December 8th, 2000, requesting that the electric transformer cost of $120,000 be part of the project.
   - The LCRBDC wrote a letter to the COE on January 23 requesting that rather than us entering into an agreement with Highland (as a utility re-locate) the costs be treated as a project cost.

2. A pre-bid meeting was held for this project on January 4, 2001 at the Highland Town Hall.
   - Several local contractors attended this meeting.
   - We received an email from the COE on January 9, 2001 indicating the bid due date be moved back to February 6, 2001.
   - We received a letter to the COE from the Town of Highland on January 9th (dated Jan. 6) indicating they did not want the old pumping equipment.

GENERAL:

1. Utility Re-locations:
   A. On June 7, 2000 a coordination meeting was held with the COE and the LCRBDC to review, discuss, and establish an accelerated schedule to complete the entire west reach.
   B. Lou Casale submitted a utility relocation memo to Don Valk (COE attorney) on September 5th, 2000, requesting review and comments for reimbursement on public right-of-ways. (No response as of November 3rd, 2000.)
      - At our December 5th Real Estate meeting, attorney again suggested a meeting to review this. We will try to schedule it no later than mid-February, 2001.
   C. At our January 22 Real Estate meeting, we discussed money availability through the next biennium (June, 2003).
      - Many of the upcoming west reach utility re-locates may be deferred until money is available. Example: Approximately $750,000 in re-locates will be needed for Stage V-2 west of the N.S. RR and on the NIPSCO R/W west of Kennedy Avenue.
North-West Engineering Co., Inc.
- Consulting Engineering -

504 Broadway - Suite 1028 - Gary, Indiana 46402
Phone: (219) 882-6856
Fax: (219) 882-6867

January 11, 2001

Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

Attention: Mr. Jim Pokrajac

RE: Preliminary Field Check - South Grant Street
    from I-80/94 to Ridge Road
    City of Gary
    Des No. - 0090210 (Old Des No. 9980010)

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

Field Check for the referenced project will be held as follows:

Date/Time: Tuesday, February 6, 2001 - 10:00 A.M. (central standard time)
Place: Gary City Hall - 401 Broadway
       City Engineer's Office - 3rd Floor

Utilities coordinators for each utility are requested to direct their representatives to be present
during this field check to discuss any relocation or management etc. during the design of this project.

Your assistance and cooperation is requested.

Very truly yours,

Ch. Ravindranath,
Project Engineer

cc: Bob Rhoades, Area Engineer, INDOT, LPA Division
    Larry Koebcke, Area Engineer, INDOT
    Kenneth Lawrence, Design Engineer, INDOT
    Reja Asadi, Geotechnical Division, INDOT
    Charles Peller, Director, Dept. of Public Works
    Roland Elvambuena, City Engineer, City of Gary
    Imad Samara, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
    Liz McCloskey, Acting Supervisor, U.S. Fish & Wildlife
    Ameritech
    AT&T Broadband
    Indiana American Water Co.
    NIPSCO Electric
    NIPSCO Gas

C:\DOCUMENTS\GRANT1\PL-FD-CK.WPD
January 16, 2001

Mr. Michael W. Neyer, P.E., Director
Division of Water
Room W264
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

RE: Request for Permit Amendment # FW-19, 069
Little Calumet River, Lake County

Dear Mr. Neyer:

On March 12, 1999 approval was granted for the construction of a levee along the north side of River Road in Griffith, Indiana from approximately Cline Avenue to the EJ&E Railroad to the east. The permit was later amended on October 4, 2000 to incorporate the installation of a water line on the south side of the levee as requested by Butler, Fairman and Seufert, Inc. A copy of the original permit and amendment letter are attached.

On behalf of the Town of Griffith, we are requesting an amendment to the permit for the installation of an 18" storm sewer pipe through the levee near the EJ&E Railroad embankment as shown on the attached drawing and USGS map received from Torrenga, Engineering, Inc. The developer, Richard Kortenhoven, has worked with the Town to improve storm drainage in this area. The 18" culvert will have an end section on the upstream side, a concrete headwall and Neenah flapgate on the downstream side and a concrete seepage collar at approximately the midpoint of the pipe.

The flood protection levee has been constructed to within approximately 50 feet of the EJ&E Railroad right-of-way line. The completion of the levee will be performed this spring. The Contractor would like to install the 18" concrete pipe as soon as the weather breaks.

If you have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to give us a call.

Sincerely,

Dennis A. Zebell, P.E.
Client Service Leader

C: Jim Pokrajac (w/encls.)
Wayne Govert
Mike Gulley
Jim Reyome
Bill Greco
Robert Schwerd

DAZ/dt
File: B21/006ltdaz.doc
December 22, 2000

Mr. Jim Reyome,
Director of Public Works
111 North Broad Street
Town of Griffith
Griffith, Indiana 46319

RE: Three Oaks Industrial Park Addition- Indiana Avenue @ River Storm Sewer Line through Levee

Dear Mr. Reyome;

We have been contracted by Mr. Richard J. Kortenhoven to design the storm pipe through the levee that will service the above referenced site. The following is a brief description of the proposed project.

The existing drainage ditch lying along the West side of the Elgin Joliet and Eastern Railway Right of Way currently has an approximated drainage area of 17.8 acres. It collects a number of street drains along Indiana Avenue, and the rear yard runoff of the residential lots between Ridge Road and the proposed levee connection where it ties into the Railroad embankment. For this reason it is imperative that a drainage pipe be installed in line with this drainage ditch through the levee, in the position that we are showing on the accompanying plan and profile drawings.

Calculations for the amount of storm water that will be carried by this existing drainage ditch yield a proposed pipe size of 18 inches in diameter. The proposed pipe shall be an 18 inch Reinforced Concrete Pipe with a flap gate installed on the North side of the levee, and a seepage collar to reduce the amount of infiltration through the levee.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at (219)836-8918.

Very Truly Yours,

Donald C. Torrenga, P.E.
January 23, 2001

Programs and Project Management Division
Project Management Branch

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

Subject: Little Calumet River Flood Control Project. Stage V. Phase 2

Dear Mr. Pokrajac;

During the utility Coordination meeting on November 16, 2000, it became obvious that the utility companies' confidence level was low in the survey data that our civil design drawings were based upon. The design work that Stanley Consultants performed in 1995 was based upon survey data provided by the Chicago District, which was originally performed by SPACECO, who was under contract with the Chicago District. Stanley did not coordinate the locations of the utility lines with the utility companies, but took our survey on faith. The utility survey scope of work for SPACECO did not indicate a preferred method to locate the utility pipelines. The method was unspecified and left up to the contractor, and the surveyor was required to have a representative from each utility company present onsite during the work to assist with locating each of the pipelines. The survey field books that we received at the completion of the survey work do not indicate what method was used (probing vs. exposing), nor do they identify the utility company representatives that were present onsite during the completion of the survey work. We feel that it is most likely that the surveyor just probed, as that would be less expensive. Therefore, since the utility companies are now stating that the pipelines need to be exposed for them to accept the validity of a survey, a new survey is needed now. Please proceed with the new survey work in order to prevent delay of the scheduled for Fall 2001 advertising date. The receipt of the survey data is needed prior to July 2001, to maintain the current project schedule. An improved survey SOW, over the SOW used originally, can be provided for the LCRBDC's use to facilitate this activity.

If you have any additional questions please contact me at the telephone number 312-353-6400, extension 1809.

Sincerely,

Imad Samara
Project Manager
INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
LaPORTE DISTRICT  
P.O. Box 429  
LaPorte, IN 46352  
(219) 362-6125  
FAX: (219) 325-7516  
An Equal Opportunity Employer • http://www.state.in.us/dot

FRANK O'BANNON, Governor  
CRISTINE M. KLIIKA, Commissioner

Rani Engineering, Inc.  
556 Rice Street  
St. Paul, MN 55103

Ann: Susan P. Rani, PE

Dear Ms. Rani:

I apologize for the delay in responding to your letter of September 12, 2000 regarding the Little Calumet River Flood Protection Project – Stage 6 Phase 2.

In response to your request for input on the three issues you raise, we offer the following:

- **Slide Gates on Highway Culverts:** The culverts in place were installed to equalize the water level on each side of SR 912, Cline Avenue, so as not to cause unequal pressure on the highway embankment. The fill material used to construct the roadway was sand. The embankment was not designed nor intended to serve as a levee to retain a higher water level on one side. The use of slide gates would cause unequal water pressure on the embankment and endanger the roadway. This cannot be allowed.

- **Recreational Trail on INDOT R/W:** INDOT does not construct nor maintain recreational trails. We do have some crossing our facilities. These are constructed and maintained by agencies/organizations through our permit process. The location of your proposed trail is along a local service/access road. Although INDOT constructed it we will be attempting to relinquish control and maintenance of it to the appropriate local jurisdiction. Any permit to construct a trail would be subject to approval of the local jurisdiction.

- **Signal for Pedestrian Crossing on Cline Avenue:** INDOT has serious concerns with this request. Motorists on SR 912 are in no way going to expect pedestrians crossing the highway. This is not a good location for a pedestrian crossing.

Please contact me at the above address or e-mail: dbraham@indot.state.in.us or telephone (219) 325-7520 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Donald C. Abraham  
Development Engineer

DCA/aw  
cc: file

cc: Eric Sampson USACE-Chicago 5
MEMORANDUM FOR ED-D (Schmidt)
       ED-C (Travia)
       ED-GT (Bush, Baig)
       ED-DS (Sampson)
       ED-HH (Ackerson)
       RE (Clancy)
       CO-S (Karwatka, Waldrom)
       PP-PM (Samara; for J. Pokrajac, and J. Flora)

SUBJECT: Little Calumet River, Indiana
Local Flood Protection and Recreation
Stage VII - Columbia Avenue and Northcote Avenue
Architect Engineer (A-E) Contract for the delivery of
plans and specifications (DACW23-99-C-0054)
QA Backcheck for Initial (50%) submittal review comment
Responses
"75%" Plans and Specs

             b. Little Cal, Stage VII QA Plan, dated 01 July 00.

1. The "75%" Plans and Specs Submittal has been delivered by
Earth Tech for the subject project. The purpose of this
submittal is not to incorporate all the comments and responses
from the 50% review, but to focus primarily on Real Estate
issues. It is both the District's, and the Local Sponsor's goal
to have final real estate drawings completed for the 100% P&S
submittal on February 16, 2001. Therefore, the primary
participants at this stage of the project design will be the LRC-
ED-DC, LRC-RE, the LCRBDC, and R.W. Armstrong.

3. With respect to Real Estate, all outstanding issues need to
be addressed as soon as possible. To accomplish this goal, the
entities noted in paragraph 1 above should review the 75% plans
submitted, and any review comments generated should be submitted
via email to the undersigned. These will also be forwarded
without comment directly to Earth Tech for response and inclusion
into the 100% submittal set. If you are satisfied with the 75%
plans, please indicate this status via email as well.

2. In addition to the 75% plans, the 50% PDT and BCOE review
comment responses were also provided. All recipients of this
memorandum are requested to please review the responses made by
Earth Tech to your comments. If you are satisfied with these
SUBJECT: Architect Engineer (A-E) Contract for the Little Calumet River Flood Protection and Recreation, Stage VII project, Earth-Tech Environment & Infrastructure Inc. QA Review for 75% Plans submittal, and 50% comment responses

responses, no action is needed, although I would recommend retaining these comments and responses for use during the 100% P&S PDT and BCOE reviews. If further discussion with Earth Tech is necessary, please email me your rebuttal to Earth Tech's response. Within this message, please restate both the comment and response, so that the subject matter is clear to all readers. I will pass this on to Earth Tech, and an electronic papertrail will be developed to track any outstanding issues. Please complete this backcheck of technical issues NLT 25 January 01.

4. The following items have been distributed:

75% full-size Plan sets: LRC-ED-DC (2 sets)
LRC-RE (1 set)
LRC-CO-S (1 set)
PP-PM for LCRBDC & R.W. Armstrong (3 sets)

50% Review Comment Responses: all memo recipients

Gatewell Structure evaluation letter: ED-D, ED-DC, ED-HH, ED-DS, and PP-PM for LCRBDC

Consolidation Test Results by Terracon: ED-D, ED-DC, ED-GT

Sheet Pile issues memorandum: ED-D, ED-DC, ED-DS, and PP-PM for LCRBDC.

5. Any further questions or comments regarding this item should be directed to the undersigned.

Timothy J. Kroll, P.E.
Technical Advisor
## COMMENTS and RESPONSES

**Project:** Little Calumet River, Stage VII Flood Protection and Recreation (38507)
**Review Item:** Initial Submittal from Earth Tech (50% Plans and Specs)
**Reviewer:** J. Schmidt (COR), E. Clancy (RE), L. Bush (ED-GT), R. Ackerson (ED-HH)
E. Sampson (ED-DS), A. Travia (ED-C), T. Kroll (ED-DC), E. Karwatka (CO-S)
B. Waldrom (CO-S), J. Flora (R.W. Armstrong: local sponsor's consultant), and
J. Pokrajac (LCRBDC's representative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reviewer</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>Flora / Pokrajac</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. During sheet pile driving nearby properties typically experience considerable noise and vibration. What mitigating measures will be taken to minimize impacts on adjacent properties?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Sheet pile driving in locations such as this project also many times experience claims from nearby properties for damage such as foundation and interior wall cracking. How have the costs of dealing with these claims been factored into the costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Tech's letter of April 6, 2000 refers to earlier stages of the project and cost data from FDM-5. Our letter of July 5, 2000 still indicated that this was a concern. At our Nov. 1, 2000 Technical Issues meeting with the Corps this issue was also discussed. It is our recollection that the Corps was to look into what measures had been taken at other Corps projects and get back to us with more information. As of this date we are still waiting for an answer that addresses the conditions of this stage of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Will address in specs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Contractor responsibility as will be described in specs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps to respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>Flora / Pokrajac</td>
<td></td>
<td>f. See attached letter dated November 18, 2000 from Dr. Mark Reshkin with his comments concerning installation of sheet piling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>Sheet G-1 Flora / Pokrajac</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Why is this project referred to as Stage VII-4 North – 4 South rather than just Stage VII?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised per comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Craib, Robert A LRC <Robert.A.Craib@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
To: 'litlecal@nirpc.org' <litlecal@nirpc.org>
Cc: Samara, Imad LRC <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>; Deja, Tom LRC <Tom.Deja@lrc02.usace.army.mil>; Anderson, Douglas M LRC <Douglas.M.Anderson@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Date: Monday, January 22, 2001 3:10 PM
Subject: Status of Pump Rehab 1B

81st.
1. Contractor has delivered and stored new discharge pipe for pumps.
2. Contractor has delivered and stored new jib and gantry crane.
3. Contractor is making structural modifications to concrete inlet and discharge boxes.
4. Contractor is creating an opening in the CMUs to provide access for pump removal and installation.
5. Laying out of new electrical system work is ongoing.
6. New SWP pumps are expected on site soon.

SE Hessville
1. Contractor has delivered and stored new concrete reinforcement steel for discharge modifications.
2. Contractor is preparing to saw cut the discharge box and make the required changes.

01/23/2001
Don:

We just received some information from Jim Pokrajac of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission. Jim is the gentleman who stated at the Preconstruction conference that he would look into potential local companies that may be able to provide support for rebuilding the pumps.

Jim indicated that he contacted Rick Sutton from the Hammond Sanitary District (HSD). Mr. Sutton told Jim that HSD has used Viking Engineering for a number of years to do similar work. Viking reportedly has the capability to do the work in-house, including fabricating and machining.

Please note that this is not in any way a recommendation or suggestion you use Viking Engineering. As a matter of fact, I have never had any experiences with Viking whatsoever. I have no idea of Viking's capabilities or lack thereof.

If Jim identifies any more local firms who could possibly help you, I'll let you know.

Doug
January 25, 2001

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

Dear Imad:

Enclosed is a copy of an e-mail to John Bach dated January 8, 2001 regarding the electrical service upgrade costs for the 5th Street stormwater pump station. As indicated in this enclosure in item #2, it is the understanding from the town of Highland, as well as the understanding of the Development Commission, that this upgrade should be treated as a project cost. Currently, the town of Highland has a proposed agreement with NIPSCO in the amount of $117,000 to upgrade this electric. They will pay NIPSCO this amount of money prior to the start of construction and, afterwards, a 30 month pay-back period will be involved for reimbursement.

It is the position of the Development Commission that as a project cost, we would pay, as with other project cost agreements, 7% cash of the construction cost estimate. Please contact me to discuss this and to arrange for the payment agreement with NIPSCO.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent  
Land Management/engineering

/sjm  
encl.  
cc: John Bach, Town of Highland  
Terry Hodnik, NIES Engineering  
Jan Plachta, COE  
Jim Flora, R.W.Armstrong Co.
From:  Terry Hodnik <thodnik@niesengineering.com>
To:    John Bach <highlandpwd@aol.com>
Cc:    Jim Flora <jflora@rwa.com>; Jim Pokrajac <littlecal@nirpc.org>; Imad Samara <imad.samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Date:  Monday, January 08, 2001 2:37 PM
Subject: 5th Street Stormwater Pump Station - Electrical Service Upgrade Cost

1. With reference to the Town's Dec 8,2000 letter requesting reimbursement for about $120,000 in costs for NIPSCO to upgrade the electrical service at the 5th Street Pump Station, I had two conversations with USACE's Imad Samara today. I will try to summarize USACE's current position, as expressed by Imad.

2. It is my understanding that USACE feels that the $120,000 for electrical service upgrades is considered a valid project cost. Unfortunately, there is a major procurement regulation obstacle in the way that prevents the Corps from passing the cost on to the Contractor and paying for it with federal dollars. The electrical service upgrade contract will be between NIPSCO and the station owner, in this case the Town of Highland. The proposed NIPSCO contract calls for the Town to pay $120,000 up front with 2-1/2 year payback provision. The payback provision essentially says that, if NIPSCO can recover the entire $120,000 in increased electrical power usage over the next 2-1/2 years, they will refund the entire $120,000 to the Town at the end of the 2-1/2 year period. Whatever portion of the original $120,000 NIPSCO cannot recover in the 2-1/2 year period from increased electrical power usage will be retained by NIPSCO since they will own the transformer. USACE's procurement regulations simply cannot deal with the federal government making a payment now to Highland in consideration that there may be a possible credit coming back to the Town 2-1/2 years from now. I offered for the Town to sign over any future credit to the federal government for the upfront payment of $120,000, but apparently this cannot be done within existing procurement regulations. In my opinion, it will be very difficult for NIPSCO to recover the entire $120,000 over the next 2-1/2 years from increased electrical usage. Even though connected horsepower is now greater, the horsepower requirements that the pumps actually see probably will not increase much, unless we have 2-1/2 above average years on precipitation. Since this is a stormwater pump station, an accurate prediction of electrical usage increase would be very difficult to make.

3. Imad suggests that the best way to do this is to have Highland pay the electrical service upgrade costs upfront and have the local sponsor, LCRBDC, reimburse the Town 2-1/2 years later when the actual portion paid back in higher electrical usage becomes known. In this case, the $120,000 would be paid for out of the local 25% match instead of federal dollars.
From: Samara, Imad LRC <Imad.Samara@irc02.usace.army.mil>  
To: Samara, Imad LRC <Imad.Samara@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Plachta, Jan S LRC  
<Jan.S.Plachta@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Schmidt, Joseph J LRC  
<Joseph.J.Schmidt@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Sampson, Eric LRC  
<Eric.Sampson@irc02.usace.army.mil>; White, Bill G LRC  
<Bill.G.White@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Deja, Tom LRC  
<Tom.Deja@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Mazanec, James G LRC  
<James.G.Mazanec@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Bush, Leslie C LRC  
<Leslie.C.Bush@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Clancy, Emmett T LRC  
<Emmett.T.Clancy@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Ackerson, Rick D LRC  
<Rick.D.Ackerson@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Albert, Dick LRC  
<Dick.Albert@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Moore, Gregory LRC  
<Gregory.Moore@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Salinas-Nix, Velma LRC  
<Velma.Salinas-Nix@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Patel, Umer I LRC  
<Umer.I.Patel@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Marella, Guy J LRC  
<Guy.J.Marella@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Trehan, Stephen R LRC  
<Stephen.R.Trehan@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Shah, Bharat S LRC  
<Bharat.S.Shah@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Corbitt, Betty A LRC  
<Betty.A.Corbitt@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Travia, Anthony J LRC  
<Anthony.J.Travia@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Davis, Susanne J LRC  
<Susanne.J.Davis@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Kroll, Tim LRC  
<Tim.Kroll@irc02.usace.army.mil>; McClendon, Katherine L LRC  
<Katherine.L.McClendon@irc02.usace.army.mil>; O’riley, James M LRC  
<James.M.O’riley@irc02.usace.army.mil>; Anderson, Douglas M LRC  
<Douglas.M.Anderson@irc02.usace.army.mil>; 'Sandy Mordus'  
<smordus@nirpc.org>; Lowe, Jim LRP <Jim.Lowe@lrp02.usace.army.mil>;  
Anderson, Douglas M LRC <Douglas.M.Anderson@irc02.usace.army.mil>

Date: Tuesday, January 09, 2001 4:16 PM

Subject: North 5th Pump Station Update

This solicitation will be amended and the projected bid open date is Tuesday Feb 6.

Imad Samara  
Project Manager  
111 N. Canal Street  
Chicago, IL 60606
January 6, 2001

Mr. Imad Samara, Project Manager
US Army Corps of Engineers
111 N. Canal St., Ste 600
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

RE: 5th Street Stormwater Pump Station Clarifications

Dear Mr. Samara:

At the Pre-bid Meeting on January 4, 2001, several items of interest to the Town of Highland were discussed. The Town’s comments are summarized below:

1. The Town does not want the old pumping equipment that will be removed during this project. It should be removed and disposed of by the Contractor.
2. The Town will allow the temporary use of electrical power available in the Pump Station by the Contractor during construction.
3. Dry Weather Pump 1 (DWP1) is out of service and DWP2 has recently failed. The Town would prefer not to spend a significant amount of dollars on DWP2 to get it restored to service since it will soon be replaced with a new pump. The current contract developed by USACE allows the Contractor to use DWP2 to pump down the wet well. We request that an addendum be issued requiring the Contractor to pump down the wet well without reliance on DWP2.

Please call if you have any questions concerning these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John M. Bach
Director of Public Works

Cc: Mr. Jim Pokrajac
    Mr. Bob Crab"
MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Monthly Minority Participation Updates
Local Flood Protection and Recreation Project
Little Calumet River, Indiana

1. Enclosed are the Minority Utilization Updates for the following projects:
   a) DACW27-00-C-0003; IV-1 North; Dillon Construction, Inc. – November 2000.
   b) DACW27-00-C-0015; IV-1 South; Dyer Construction Company, Inc. – November 2000.
   c) DACW27-00 C-0021; Burr Betterment; Dyer Construction Company, Inc. – November 2000.

2. Any questions concerning the updates shall be directed to the undersigned at (219) 923-1763/4.

THOMAS A. DEJA, P.E.
Area Engineer
Calumet Area Office

Copies Furnished:
CELRC-CO (R. Deda) w/Encl.
CELRC-CO-C (D. Albert) w/Encl.
CELRC-CO-S (00-0003 – Minority Partic.) w/Encl.
CELRC-CO-S (00-0015 – Minority Partic.) w/Encl.
CELRC-CO-S (00-0021 – Minority Partic.) w/Encl.
CELRC-CO-S (T. Deja) w/Encl.
CELRC-PP-PM (I. Samara) w/Encl.
CELRC-CT (V. Salinas-Nix) w/Encl.
LCRBDC (J. Pokrajac) w/Encl.
**PERIOD ENDING NOVEMBER 30, 2000**

**LITTLE CARMAN RIVER FLOOD PROTECTION & RECREATION PROJECT**

**CONTRACT NO.** DACW27-00-C-0004546

**LOCATION** GARY, IN

**CONTRACTOR** DILLON CONTRACTORS, INC. 3,001,491.57

1. LABOR UTILIZATION STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ALL EMPLOYEES BY TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS BLACK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS AMER. INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE</th>
<th>MAJORITY PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATORS</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>5416</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATERERS</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARPENTERS</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTUAL TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2360</strong></td>
<td><strong>13443</strong></td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
<td><strong>1534</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td><strong>617</strong></td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACT GOALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. MATERIALS, SUPPLIES & MISCELLANEOUS PURCHASES STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OF ALL PURCHASES</th>
<th>PURCHASES WITHIN LAKE COUNTY, IN</th>
<th>PURCHASES WITHIN GARY, IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,510</td>
<td>$3,510</td>
<td>$3,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,203</td>
<td>$4,203</td>
<td>$4,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$7,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,713</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SUBCONTRACTS STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL OF ALL</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AWARDED</td>
<td>LAKE COUNTY, IN</td>
<td>GARY, INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIS 1Q WITH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT [1,452]</td>
<td>18,745.54</td>
<td>18,745.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td></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 DISADV. BUSINESS</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>TOTAL PAYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SUBCONTRACTING PLAN COMPARISON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>ACTUAL TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(As a minimum, the Contractor shall address the items listed in subparagraphs (a) (1) through (16) found in Contract Clause entitled AFFIRMATIVE ACTION COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSTRUCTION in Section 00700 of the contract. The Contractor shall attach all necessary documentation to this report in support of its claimed efforts and actions to comply with the referenced subparagraphs.)

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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>LARGE BUS</th>
<th>SMALL BUS</th>
<th>WBE</th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>AWARD AMT</th>
<th>PAYMENT TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Excavating, Inc.</td>
<td>West Lafayette, IN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,215,812.60</td>
<td>$1,174,565.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lake Soil &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Lansing, IL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$8,601.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk Enterprises</td>
<td>Crown Point, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$13,300.00</td>
<td>$11,912.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoosier Barricade</td>
<td>Bremen, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,250.00</td>
<td>$22,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illian Fence</td>
<td>Gary, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,598.22</td>
<td>$15,647.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rieth Riley/Gary</td>
<td>Gary, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$30,775.00</td>
<td>$22,882.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risch Construction</td>
<td>Schereville, IN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,975.00</td>
<td>$8,585.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell's Tree Service</td>
<td>Demotte, IN</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,000.00</td>
<td>$72,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellon's Landscape</td>
<td>Gary, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$15,773.17</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

$1,450,483.99 | $1,336,994.43

**Lake County TOTAL**

$143,480.99 | $152,152.04

**Gary IN Total**

$76,146.39 | $83,021.94
**1. LABOR UTILIZATION STATUS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ALL EMPLOYEES BY TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS BLACK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>MINORITY PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>452.00</td>
<td>2,108.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>505.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>258.50</td>
<td>1,091.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>91.50</td>
<td>489.50</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>149.50</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Drivers</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>648.00</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>1,172.00</td>
<td>4,486.50</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>505.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACT GOALS**

|                      | 40.00%    | 6.90%   |

**2. LABOR UTILIZATION STATUS: SUBCONTRACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ALL EMPLOYEES BY TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS BLACK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>MINORITY PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>234.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.50</td>
<td>111.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.00</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>6.00</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>0.00</td>
<td>267.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>111.50</td>
<td>111.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACT GOALS**

|                      | 40.00%    | 6.90%   |

**2. MATERIAL, SUPPLIES, & MISCELLANEOUS PURCHASES STATUS:**
**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD PROJECT - LEVEE CONSTRUCTION BURR BETTERMENT**

**NOVEMBER 2000 MINORITY UTILIZATION UPDATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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 AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>THIS MONTH AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO DATE AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19,882.29</td>
<td>83.05%</td>
<td>$113,751.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$398,810.76</td>
<td>28.52%</td>
<td>$2,259.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,262.66</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>$173,450.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$597,905.65</td>
<td>43.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. SUBCONTRACTS STATUS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OF ALL AWARDED SUBCONTRACTS</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN LAKE CO., INDIANA</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN GARY, INDIANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THIS MONTH TO DATE AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>THIS MONTH TO DATE AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$98,000.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBCONTRACTS (AT ANY TIER) AWARDED UNDER THIS CONTRACT:**

- Homer Tree Service, Lockport, IL
- Drainage & Ground Improvements, Bridgeville, PA
- Central Landscaping, Priceville, IL
- James H. Drew Corporation, Indianapolis, IN

**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>TOTAL SUBCONTRACTING</td>
<td>$429,600.00</td>
<td>25.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE BUSINESS</td>
<td>$76,500.00</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL BUSINESS</td>
<td>$353,100.00</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$353,100.00</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **ACTION TAKEN TO PROMOTE MINORITY PARTICIPATION (WORKFORCE AND SUBCONTRACTING):**


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: 14 Dec 00
# Little Calumet River Flood Project - Levee Construction Phase I, South

**November 2000 Minority Utilization Update**

## 1. Labor Utilization Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ALL EMPLOYEES BY TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS BLACK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>MINORITY PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>283.50</td>
<td>3,063.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1,017.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>513.00</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>20.00</td>
<td>201.00</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers</td>
<td>570.00</td>
<td>1,586.00</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>912.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,380.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Goals**

## 2. Subcontractor Labor Utilization Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS ALL EMPLOYEES BY TRADE</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS BLACK</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS HISPANIC</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS PACIFIC ISLANDER</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>MINORITY PERCENTAGE</th>
<th>FEMALE PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
<td>TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Engineers</td>
<td>296.00</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41.00</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>296.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>378.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contract Goals**

---

Little Calumet River Levee, Phase I South

Page No. 1

Run Date: 12/13/2000 02:00 PM
2. MATERIAL, SUPPLIES, & MISCELLANEOUS PURCHASES STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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 TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH TOTAL TO DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$23,007.40</td>
<td>$1,121,759.63</td>
<td>$2,946.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. SUBCONTRACTS STATUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OF ALL AWARDED SUBCONTRACTS</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN LAKE CO. INDIANA</th>
<th>AWARDED WITHIN GARY, INDIANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THIS MONTH TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH TOTAL TO DATE</td>
<td>THIS MONTH TOTAL TO DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
<td>% OF TOTAL AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$88,200.00</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 M.B.E.</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>COMPLETED TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREAT LAKES TESTING</td>
<td>BURR RIDGE, IL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMBERMASTERS, INC.</td>
<td>SCHERERVILLE, IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$28,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAINAGE &amp; GROUND IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>BRIDGEVIEW, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$28,200.00</td>
<td>$26,125.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBCONTRACTING PLAN COMPARISON:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>ACTUAL TO DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SUBCONTRACTING</td>
<td>$345,600.00</td>
<td>$88,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGE BUSINESS</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL BUSINESS</td>
<td>$345,600.00</td>
<td>$88,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$315,500.00</td>
<td>$98,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVANTAGED SMALL</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dyer Construction Company, Inc.

1716 SHEFFIELD AVENUE - DYER, INDIANA 46311
PHONES: (219) 865-2961, (732) 721-7868, (708) 895-3339 - FAX: (219) 865-2963

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD PROJECT - LEVEE CONSTRUCTION PHASE I, SOUTH
NOVEMBER 2000 MINORITY UTILIZATION UPDATE

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


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]

NAME

14 DEC 00

DATE
January 25, 2001

Honorable Frances Dupey, President
Lake County Commissioners' Office
Lake County Government Center
2293 N. Main Street
Crown Point, Indiana 46307

Dear Commissioner Dupey:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission Board, at its January 10th public meeting, directed me to send to you the attendance records for the Development Commission members for the years 1999 and 2000.

The Lake County Commissioners' appointment to the Development Commission is Marion Williams. Also enclosed is the current letter of his appointment indicating the term of his appointment.

If you have any questions regarding this, please feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

/sjm
encl.
cc: Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
Marion Williams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Delaney</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tanke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Colvin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Vosti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Agnew</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Carlson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Davis</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Huffman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mroczkowski</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Williams</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mark Reshkin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeMeo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTENDANCE ROSTER**

Beginning of Term → X ABS

Resigned
# ATTENDANCE ROSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Delaney</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tanke</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlene Colvin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Vosti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning of Term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Agnew</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Carlson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Davis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Huffman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mroczkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning of Term</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Williams</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeMeo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

STATE OF INDIANA  
COUNTY OF LAKE  

WE, the undersigned, duly elected, commissioned, qualified and acting members of the Board of Commissioners of the County of Lake, Indiana, do hereby constitute and appoint Marion Williams, as a Board Member of the Little Calumet River Basin Commission for a term commencing January 1, 1996, to expire on the 31st day of December 2001. IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, We hereunto subscribe our names this 3rd day of February, 1999.

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
OF THE COUNTY OF LAKE

[Signatures]

RUDOLPH CLAY

ATTEST:

PETER BENJAMIN, AUDITOR