MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2002
AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, IN

EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS REAL ESTATE ISSUES
4:00 – PLEASE TRY TO BE HERE

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 September 5, 2002
5. Chairman’s Report
   - Report on NAFSMA conference held 9/10-13/02
6. Executive Director’s Report
   - Presentation by Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
7. Old Business
   - Property Liability Insurance update
   - USGS gauge stations operation – payment status
8. Standing Committees
   A. Land Acquisition/Management Committee – Arlene Colvin, Chairperson
      Land Acquisition
      • Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
      • Other Issues
      Land Management
      • GSD issues letter sent to COE week of September 30th
      • O&M spreadsheet for Gary (refer to handout)
      • Disposition of property recommendation
      • Recommendations on land rentals
      • Other Issues
   B. Environmental Committee – Mark Reshkin, Chairman
      • Report on offers status for Hobart Marsh mitigation
      • Update on in-project land lease/option
      • Report of results of COE bid opening – In-project lands restoration
      • Other Issues
   C. Legislative Committee – George Carlson, Chairman
      • Budget request to be submitted to State Budget Agency
      • Congressional Committee funding authorization increase for Little Calumet River flood Control project to $186,300,000
      • Other Issues
   D. Project Engineering Committee – Bob Huffman, Chairman
      • Stage III Remediation bids received on September 10th
      • Auxiliary power inspection at N. Burr St. Pump Station on September 13th
      • Meeting with INDOT scheduled for October 7th re: Tri State drainage issue
      • Other Issues
   E. Recreational Development Committee – Emerson Delaney, Chairman
      • No Recreational work scheduled until Recreation Phase 2 is released
   F. Marina Development Committee – Bill Tanke, Chairman
      • City has financial information requested by Bank One - Meeting to be scheduled soon
      • Other issues
   G. Finance Committee – Curt Vostl, Chairman
      • Financial status report
      • Approval of claims for September 2002
      • Other Issues
   H. Policy Committee – George Carlson, Chairman
      • Issues
   I. Public Relations Committee – Bob Marszalek, Chairman
      • Issues

9. Other Issues
10. New Business
11. Statements to the Board from the Floor
12. Set date for next meeting
SPECIAL COMMISSION MEETING
6:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16
COMMISSION OFFICES
PORTAGE, IN

1. Chairman's Issues for Discussion
   A. Future of Commission
   B. Funding vs. No funding
   C. Employees – Plan
   D. How do we Maintain?
   E. Corps Relationship
   F. Need Written Plan
   G. Discussions - Full Commission vs. Committee

2. Commission’s Funds Available to Address Administrative, Operating, and Future Project Needs
   A. Finance Committee meeting held October 10 providing figures

3. Other Items for Discussion
   A. Reminder of new procedure for Nominating Committee (November meeting)
   B. Consideration of Executive Committee establishment for between meeting policy guidance
   C. Consideration of changing December 5 meeting date to Wednesday, December 11.

4. Other Issues
October 1, 2002

Ms. Marilyn Schultz
State Budget Director
State Budget Agency
212 State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Ms. Schultz:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission respectfully submits a capital funding request in the 2003-2005 State biennial budget of $7 million. This amount of new capital money is needed in addition to the $2.5 million restored from the 2001-03 capital budget to meet the Federal construction capability supported by Congressman Pete Visclosky.

The requested State capital appropriation would be spent on targeted priority project categories that have been set through discussions with the Corps of Engineers, Congressman Visclosky's office, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and Governor O'Bannon's representatives. The dollars requested would go toward federally-credited items of needed non-federal participation to (1) obtain a Department of Natural Resources “construction in a floodway permit” for the entire five mile remaining reach of the project (covering the communities of Hammond, Highland and Munster); and (2) accomplish maximum property acquisition and utility relocations to spend for flood control construction the $21,054,300 the Corps of Engineers has earmarked for Federal fiscal Years 2003, 2004, and 2005 – the period covered by this State biennium.

The Development Commission clearly recognizes and appreciates the State’s fiscal situation; but we feel funding for this project would leverage significant Federal construction monies, move significantly toward completing a project all acknowledge has extended too long (which causes increased project costs), and provide construction jobs and needed flood protection to over 7,000 homes, businesses and institutions in the heavily developed I-80/94 corridor.
Ms. Marilyn Schultz
October 1, 2002
Page 2

At the direction of the State Budget Committee, the Development Commission is pursuing local contributions to assist in the non-federal costs of the project. We can assure you that the Development Commission and the local municipalities are sensitive to the financial situation and are committed to bringing local resources to supplement the State funding. To document this commitment, listed below are the ongoing initiatives and the estimated local dollar contributions.

A. Burr Street Betterment Levee, Phase 2 – Gary
   Description: Compilation of last segment of levee in Gary. Not COE creditable due to “betterment”.
   Action: Mayor Scott King of Gary is pursuing use of $2,800,000+ of 2003 city casino revenue to complete non-federal commitment, which would finish the east reach of the project; allow the City of Gary to be removed from the floodplain; access $2,700,000 of federal construction monies; and fulfill a major piece toward obtaining a west reach “construction in a floodway” permit.

Local Contribution $2,800,000+

B. West Reach Public Property Donation (Stages VI-1 and VI-2)
   Description: The property needed for the west reach of the project includes several hundred acres owned by the Hammond Park Board and the Town of Highland.
   Action: To approach each municipality to “donate” at no cost the rights of entry and use of the several hundred public acres. The property has just been appraised and the value of the land will be credited to the non-federal share.

Local Contribution: Hammond - + 10 acres - $242,000
                  Highland - 160 acres - $270,000
                  $512,000 Total

C. Highland/Hammond/Gary Pump Stations Operation
   Description: The Development Commission has an agreement with the Town of Highland for operation and maintenance of 2 pump station facilities. We are now working on a similar agreement for the city of Hammond for operation of their pump stations. Also, Gary Sanitary District is in final negotiations to do the same for their pump stations.
   Local Contribution: A savings of some $20,000/station or several hundred thousand dollars of local commitments will be made by the local sanitary districts.
In summary, the Development Commission is requesting the $7 million new capital funds and access to the $2.5 million from the 2001-2003 state to meet the federal construction capability of $21,054,300 in the period of the next state biennial budget. To clearly identify where the requested dollars would be spent, the following categories are earmarked. All categories are federally creditable.

**BUDGET REQUEST CATEGORIES**

- **Project Mitigation Acquisition at Hobart Marsh**
  - 13 tracts – 334 acres
  - $1,100,000

- **Project West Reach Land Acquisition**
  - Stage VI-1
    - 17 residential, 20 businesses
    - $1,000,000
  - Stage VI-2
    - 10 residential
    - $396,000
  - Stage V-2
    - 19 residential, 6 businesses
    - $1,254,000
  - Stage V-3
    - 1 corporate, 1 railroad
    - $1,750,000
  - Total
    - $4,400,000

- **Utility Relocations**
  - 109 utility relocations
  - $2,000,000

- **Professional Services to Accomplish Acquisitions/Relocations**
  - $700,000

- **Non-Federal Cash Contribution (7% of Federal construction)**
  - $1,300,000

**TOTAL NEED**

- $9,500,000

Attached for further documentation is the spreadsheet showing Corps of Engineers spending over the next three Federal Fiscal years with the non-federal requirements also listed.

Members of the Development Commission stand ready to come to Indianapolis to explain this submission or testify to any budget hearings. Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

Encl.

Cc: Congressman Visclosky’s Office
    Senator Lugar’s Office
    Senator Bayh’s Office
    N.W. IN State Legislative delegation
    Jeff Viohl, Governor’s Office
    Beth Compton, Governor’s Office
    Sean Fahey, IDNR
# Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project

## Projected Federal and Non-Federal Funding Required for Fiscal Years 2003, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Reach Recreation</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1 North</td>
<td>$3,015,911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-1 South</td>
<td>$4,265,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 1</td>
<td>$2,169,453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 2</td>
<td>$2,672,547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1A</td>
<td>$4,714,172</td>
<td>$1,760,180</td>
<td>$1,335,922</td>
<td>$1,674,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1B</td>
<td>$2,041,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Ed Lake Pump Sta.</td>
<td>$2,939,000</td>
<td>$610,598</td>
<td>$495,998</td>
<td>$706,598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoist Labor &amp; Professional Services</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE Contracts</td>
<td>$1,095,000</td>
<td>$132,990</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-1</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-3</td>
<td>$2,465,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$2,245,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation</td>
<td>$1,055,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$372,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,290,000</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>$2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation-Hobart Marsh</td>
<td>$1,055,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$372,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,290,000</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>$2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 (Reclamation)</td>
<td>$1,083,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$2,310,000</td>
<td>$378,000</td>
<td>$2,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$1,735,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 2</td>
<td>$6,475,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,941,768</td>
<td>$2,519,728</td>
<td>$1,422,040</td>
<td>$2,361,768</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$613,300</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$76,700 (Grace St. Pump Stations)</td>
<td>$76,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This weekend mitigation is being done on project limits*

**Burr Street Budget**
- Construction: $4,842,000
- Engineering: $484,000
- Contractor: $583,000
- Design Management: $1,587,000
- Other: $2,700,000
- Non-Federal: $3,077,000

**The Non Federal Costs are shown by category in the 2nd year of the biennium for clarity.**
For Immediate Release
September 25, 2002

Water Project Authorizations Reported Out of Committee
Committee agrees that nearly $240 million in federal funding should be authorized for flood control, sewers, and ecosystem repairs in Northwest Indiana

Washington, D.C. – Congressman Pete Visclosky (D-Merrillville) has received committee approval for provisions in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) for 2002 that will authorize $239,446,000 in federal spending on five water projects in Northwest Indiana.

The new language, reported out of the U.S. House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, authorizes $186,300,000 in spending for the Little Calumet River flood control project; $23,146,000 for the Cady Marsh Ditch flood control project; and $30 million for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction. It also authorizes a modification to credit the City of Hammond for work already done toward ecosystem restoration at Wolf Lake; and a waiver of cost-sharing requirements for ecosystem restoration at Long Lake. WRDA now goes before the full House of Representatives for passage.

In the case of the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch flood-control projects, current estimated project costs exceed the original limits, and if not adjusted, they could delay vital flood protection in the communities along the Little Calumet.

"Both the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch projects are of the utmost importance to protect Northwest Indiana residents from flooding," Visclosky said. "These additional authorizations will help guard residents from life-threatening floods and costly property damage."

The increased authorization for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction adds on to $10 million authorized in WRDA in 1998 for non-federal interests requiring infrastructure needs in the First Congressional District. Funding will go to upgrade sewer systems that are at or beyond their service lives of 40-50 years; sewers of that age often have reduced flow capacity and cave-ins that lead to overflows. The additional authorization reflects redistricting, which more than doubled the geographical size of the district, and will be used in Lake, Porter, Jasper, Newton, and Benton counties.

The modifications for Wolf Lake would credit the City of Hammond for work already done on the
site. Due to the fact that necessary legal agreements have not been finalized, the city can not receive credit without these adjustments.

Work at Wolf Lake will help reduce excessive exotic plant growth, renew diversity of plant and fish species, deepen the lake, restore water quality and aquatic habitat, and mitigate contaminants. Work at Long Lake will also involve restoration of the natural ecosystem, which was altered with the construction of U.S. 12.

"The funding authorization included today in the WRDA bill will help protect homes and renew the environment," Visclosky said. "These are both important goals that will help improve the quality of life for all Northwest Indiana residents."

###
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### 2002 OPERATING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001 Budget</th>
<th>2002 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801</td>
<td>Per diem expenses</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>NIRPC Services</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Basic staff support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Mileage/expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Room rental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Postage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Copying machine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Printing/graphics labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) Office supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h) Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>Travel and Mileage</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822</td>
<td>Printing and Advertising</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823</td>
<td>Bonds and Insurance</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824</td>
<td>Telephone Costs</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825</td>
<td>Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL** $191,000.00  $191,000.00

### LAND ACQUISITION/PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001 Budget</th>
<th>2002 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5838</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840</td>
<td>Professional/Consultant Services</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>Appraisal Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>Engineering/design services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5843</td>
<td>Land Purchase contractual services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>Land management services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5845</td>
<td>Facilities/project maintenance services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5846</td>
<td>Operational services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>Surveying services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5848</td>
<td>Economic/marketing sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860</td>
<td>Project Land Purchase Contracts</td>
<td>$1,984,850.00</td>
<td>$3,170,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5861</td>
<td>Property &amp; Structures costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5862</td>
<td>Moving/relocation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5863</td>
<td>Real Estate Taxes owed account (pass through account)</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881</td>
<td>Property/Structure Insurance</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882</td>
<td>Utility Relocation Costs</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883</td>
<td>Land Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884</td>
<td>Structures Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5892</td>
<td>Project Cost Share Payments/Escrow Account</td>
<td>($350,000.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUB TOTAL** $3,109,850.00  $4,295,188.00

**TOTAL BUDGET** $4,486,188.00
## LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
### MONTHLY BUDGET REPORT, SEPTEMBER 2002

### 6 MONTH ALLOCATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
<td>11,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
<td>2,233.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
<td>60,295.74</td>
<td>64,704.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>105.60</td>
<td>730.60</td>
<td>13,269.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>522.29</td>
<td>4,477.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>304.23</td>
<td>2,130.82</td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>832.29</td>
<td>1,005.20</td>
<td>6,994.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5830 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>4,287.43</td>
<td>38,119.47</td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>207,222.64</td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>14,071.35</td>
<td>3,143,907.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>26,280.09</td>
<td>3,143,907.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>63,267.54</td>
<td>136,732.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>442,727.87</td>
<td>4,043,460.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 MONTH UNALLOCATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,850.00</td>
<td>11,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>697.33</td>
<td>526.33</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,753.47</td>
<td>746.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>9,887.63</td>
<td>10,157.58</td>
<td>10,570.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,911.06</td>
<td>34,088.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>131.04</td>
<td>616.52</td>
<td>2,143.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,621.58</td>
<td>10,378.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>608.87</td>
<td>4,391.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>616.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,747.13</td>
<td>4,252.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>976.16</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,082.67</td>
<td>5,917.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>3,841.60</td>
<td>6,029.30</td>
<td>5,733.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,724.17</td>
<td>71,275.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>33,716.95</td>
<td>65,506.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>338,876.53</td>
<td>161,123.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>33,029.00</td>
<td>3,132,721.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,466.29</td>
<td>3,132,721.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>2,233.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,501.24</td>
<td>134,498.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>60,604.45</td>
<td>52,656.22</td>
<td>84,911.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>640,900.01</td>
<td>3,845,287.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

## Financial Statement
### January 1, 2002 - August 31, 2002

### Cash Position - January 1, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checking Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receipts - January 1, 2002 - August 31, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease Rent</td>
<td>35,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income (From Checking &amp; First Nail)</td>
<td>15,052.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>504,160.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
<td>630.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>7,885.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payback From Money Market</td>
<td>329.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Family Insurance</td>
<td>7,334.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Title Ins. Company</td>
<td>221.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBLC Reimbursement Re: Telephone Charge</td>
<td>1,281.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds From Voided Checks</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td><strong>564,460.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disbursements - January 1, 2002 - August 31, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Expenses Paid in 2002</th>
<th>94,594.71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PER DIEM</td>
<td>7,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>7,180.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPC</td>
<td>89,795.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>1,699.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>608.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Expense</td>
<td>4,033.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Expense</td>
<td>2,536.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>601,985.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Position - August 31, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checking Account</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank (Base Capital Investment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank (Misc Interrelated Investment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Lehman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank One (Bancorp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank One (State Farm Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank One (Carlin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Investments** | **1,583,095.85** |
| **Escrow Account Interest Available** | **731.21** |

**Total** | **1,733,941.09**
## OPERATING REVENUE ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Ongoing Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Income</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>Ongoing Annually (Slightly reduced as we sell surplus land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest from Money Market Accounts</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Diminishing Base (Annual transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sand Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $1.5 million State Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gary Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COE Escrow Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accumulated Interest from Base Capital Investment | $258,000 | Invested |
| Sand Fund Principal (Uncommitted)                | $140,000 | Invested |
| Total                                            | $398,000 |          |

<p>| LEL Operating &amp; Maintenance Fund               | $158,000 | Agreement through 2003 (Seeking negotiation) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leases</th>
<th>Lease Agreement</th>
<th>Yearly Income</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed &amp; Tim Bult</td>
<td>$6,500 per year</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>Chase to Grant (Both sides of 35th Avenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount varies with acres farmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only interested farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Street Farm Stand</td>
<td>$1,700 per month</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>Current agreement since June 18, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Towers</td>
<td>$1,400 per month</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>Current lease since July 5, 2000 – July 5, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes Ameritech)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Increase every 5 years based on Metro Chicago Consumer Price Index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkheimer</td>
<td>$2,400 per year</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>Current lease since December 24, 1991 for $200/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No escalation clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking on 2.05 acres east of their building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Melinda Adams</td>
<td>$300 per month</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>Current lease since May 3, 2000 (No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LAMAR signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #1050</td>
<td>$600 per year</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>West side of Grant — ½ mile south of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3475</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant — South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3480</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant — South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL YEAR LEASE INCOME** $56,900
OPERATING/PROJECT NEEDS
(One year)

Commission Operation
- NIRPC Contract $125,000
  (1/2 Dan, Full time Sandy, Accounting, & Office Space)
- Commission Related Legal Retainer $8,500
- Commission Operating Expense $57,500

$191,000

Project Related Professional Services
- Legal support (Lou Casale and Angie Ogrentz)
- Land Acquisition (Judy Vamos)
- Engineering Coordination, Land Management $350,000
  (Jim Pokrajac)
- Crediting Technician (1/2 time – Lorraine Kray)
- Engineering Consultation (Jim Flora) Estimated $20,000
PROPOSED PRIORITIES FOR USE OF 2001-03 STATE BUDGET DOLLARS
15 MONTH SCHEDULE (May, 2002 thru August, 2003)
Revised: October 3, 2002

$1,761,439 Cash to draw upon currently available from the $3 million State Budget funds
- 400,000 Administration costs (Jim Pokrajac, Judy Vamos, Lorraine Kray, Sandy Mordus, Lou Casale, Jim Flora) Expended to date $1,555,049.67

$1,361,439
- 266,000 COE escrow payment due October, 2002 (7% Cash contribution) Expended to date $266,000

$1,095,439
- 250,000 Estimate for mitigation costs (Figure ½ of $500,000 earlier committed. Needed for "good faith effort") Expended to date $9,259

$ 845,439
- 25,000 Burr Street acquisition committed. Offers in process. Expended to date $4,585.61

$ 820,439
- 700,000 Kennedy Industrial Park property acquisition (VI-1) – (20 parcels) Expended to date $71,768

$ 120,439
- 75,000 Utility relocation engineering money (VI-1 & VI-2) – (approx. 16 relocates) Expended to date $385

$ 45,439
- 45,439 Estimate of ongoing title work costs for crediting purposes Expended to date $36,359

-0-
- Items not included in budget Expended to date $114,340.88

Total expenditures to date as of 9/5/02 ............ $657,747.16

Remaining monies available for drawdown as of 9/5/02 ........ $1,122,437

REMAINING $2.5 MILLION CURRENTLY RECISED BY GOVERNOR O’BANNON FROM BUILD INDIANA FUNDS FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

( -378,000) Estimate of actual utility relocation work (VI-1 & VI-2)
( - 70,000) Clean-up of remaining properties in East Reach & East Reach Remediation area
( - 50,000) Burr Street property acquisition costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
( - 100,000) Burr Street utility relocation costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
( -1,900,000) Burr Street Phase 2 construction cost (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
(-2,498,000) Total commitments from $2.5 million in budget reision
To:        Committee members Arlene Colvin, John Mroczkowski, Curt Vosti
          LCRBDC Chairman Bill Tanke
          Dan Gardner, Executive Director
          Attorney Lou Casale

From:      George Carlson, Committee Chairman

Date:      August 29, 2002

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING
12:30 P.M. WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 4, 2002

Alexander's Steak House
9144 Indianapolis Blvd.
Highland, Indiana 46322

DISCUSSION TOPICS INCLUDE:
1. Current status of State finances leading to next State budget
2. Preparation/Adoption of Commission biennial budget request
   - State Budget Agency procedural change – No request received for Commission's capital budget
3. Strategy for meeting with legislators/elected officials to gain interest for budget request

(Please RSVP to Sandy - Reservation in Dan's name)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CREDITED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash escrow – construction</td>
<td>$6,973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR properties</td>
<td>$1,225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission lands</td>
<td>$1,766,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/survey credit</td>
<td>$ 861,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Real Estate costs-submitted</td>
<td>$ 449,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation (thru 1999)</td>
<td>$1,192,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Sites</td>
<td>$ 144,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>$ 538,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract land acquisition credit</td>
<td>$ 477,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,628,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENTLY SUBMITTED/UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (by Sandy)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBLE ADMIN CHARGES SUBMITTED 8/30/02</td>
<td>$ 829,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIT SUBMITTED THAT WAS RETURNED FOR FURTHER DOCUMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission lands</td>
<td>$ 565,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD’L LAND CREDIT SUBMITTED PENDING APPROVAL 7/29/02</td>
<td>$ 21,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDS NOT YET BEGUN TO BE CREDITED</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDITED SECTION 104</td>
<td>$1,667,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CREDITABLE ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Capital invested</td>
<td>$ 700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street escrow</td>
<td>$1,703,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr St. costs incurred</td>
<td>$ 406,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Betterment escrow</td>
<td>$ 191,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lake Etta &amp; Deep River)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDNR expenditures</td>
<td>$4,715,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina costs incurred</td>
<td>$1,069,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Etta costs incurred</td>
<td>$ 568,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,353,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO BE RE-SUBMITTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Sites (difference of what we submitted &amp; what you credited)</td>
<td>$ 35,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference on Hohman Avenue pumping (Sec.104) of what they spent &amp; what you credited</td>
<td>$ 290,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$325,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENIED CREDIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Liability Insurance</td>
<td>$254,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTS NEEDING TO BE REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Bridge issue</td>
<td>$ 7-8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street Betterment Levee</td>
<td>$ 4.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY
### FUNDING HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>LCRBDC REQUEST</th>
<th>AMOUNT REC'D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 &amp; 86-87</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 &amp; 88-89</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90 &amp; 90-91</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 &amp; 92-93</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94 &amp; 94-95</td>
<td>$7 million</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96 &amp; 96-97</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98 &amp; 98-99</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00 &amp; 00-01</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02 &amp; 02-03</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td>$18.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52 million</td>
<td>$24.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/11/00
FEDERAL FUNDING HISTORY

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Appropriation Category</th>
<th>Fiscal Year Allocation</th>
<th>Cumulative Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>$367,700</td>
<td>$367,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>1,005,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>1,342,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,366,000</td>
<td>3,708,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,703,000</td>
<td>6,411,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,013,000</td>
<td>9,424,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>10,146,000</td>
<td>19,570,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>13,842,700</td>
<td>33,413,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>1,569,600</td>
<td>34,983,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,848,000</td>
<td>38,831,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>9,639,000</td>
<td>48,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,378,000</td>
<td>56,848,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>5,657,000</td>
<td>62,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,061,000</td>
<td>70,566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>In Appropriations Bill</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
<td>79,366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>84,366,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here is the list of tracts in priority order. Priority is based on getting lands adjacent to existing public lands, so that future management/ownership needs are more easily met:

1. Kim, 73ac 18 hydric soil ac
2. Nozrik (3 parcels) 60ac 20 hydric soil ac
3. Faddell 33ac 16 hydric soil ac
4. Bundalo 20ac 9 hydric soil ac
5. Berndt (W) 16ac 7 hydric soil ac
6. Berndt (E) 36ac 31 hydric soil ac
7. Mandan-Julian 15ac 4 hydric soil ac
8. Frohman 40ac 20 hydric soil ac
9. Price 17ac 9 hydric soil ac
10. Hill 15ac
11. 2 tracts between McCloskey and 49th 10ac 1 hydric soil ac
12. Massa Trust* 100ac 37 hydric soil ac
13. Crossk 14ac 4 hydric soil ac

14. Other non-contiguous parcels can be considered if needed, once this list has been exhausted.

* 50% restoration and 50% enhancement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Activity</th>
<th>Cash (635k)</th>
<th>Land Acquisition</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Local Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 - Phase 1</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 - Phase 2</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Project Mitigation</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3 - Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Labor</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping I</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station II</td>
<td>$103,750</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation II</td>
<td>(675,960)</td>
<td>(509,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1 - Phase 2</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 - Phase 3</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 1st Clean-Up</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 2nd Clean-Up</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr St. 1 year</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr St. 2 year</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Cost Share: 2003 - $70,000; 2004 - $67,000; 2005 - $70,000
Land Acquisition: 4,189,500
Utilities: 2,248,000
Mitigation: 1,000,000
Admin. Contracts: 100,000
Insurance: 100,000
O&M Costs: 9,571,490

Total: $70,000,000

*Does not include any Burr St. costs*
### LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND RECREATION PROJECT


| CONTRACT | TOTAL CONTRACT COST | FY 00 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY | FY 01 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY | FY 02 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY | FY 03 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY | FY 04 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY | FY 05 Fed | Non-Fed | Total Per FY |
|----------|---------------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|-----------|---------|-------------|
| East Reach Reme. | $1,700,000 | $1,322,000 | $398,000 | $1,400,000 | $226,837 | $17,074 | $243,911 | $212,465 | $15,262 | $227,727 | $232,093 | $16,704 | $248,807 | $240,691 | $17,147 | $257,838 | $242,753 | $17,500 | $259,253 |
| W-1 North | $3,013,911 | $2,605,060 | $408,851 | $2,772,000 | $226,837 | $17,074 | $243,911 | $212,465 | $15,262 | $227,727 | $232,093 | $16,704 | $248,807 | $240,691 | $17,147 | $257,838 | $242,753 | $17,500 | $259,253 |
| W-1 South | $4,268,594 | $3,059,000 | $1,209,594 | $2,200,000 | $1,546,344 | $118,303 | $1,664,647 | $1,375,493 | $82,293 | $1,457,786 | $1,375,493 | $82,293 | $1,457,786 | $1,375,493 | $82,293 | $1,457,786 | $1,375,493 | $82,293 | $1,457,786 |
| Burr Street 1 | $2,169,453 | $579,814 | $429,180 | $1,000,000 | $655,218 | $81,434 | $736,652 | $630,725 | $76,425 | $707,150 | $630,725 | $76,425 | $707,150 | $630,725 | $76,425 | $707,150 | $630,725 | $76,425 | $707,150 |
| Burr Street 2 | $2,670,647 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pump Station 1A | $4,714,172 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pump Station 1 B | $2,041,185 | $279,000 | $210,000 | $300,000 | $1,619,011 | $121,884 | $1,741,895 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| N. 9th Pump Sta. | $2,300,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moped Labor* | $2,399,400 | $100,000 | $2,500,000 | | $1,800,000 | $1,400,000 | $2,200,000 | $1,300,000 | $1,700,000 | $1,300,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| A/E Contracts | $1,695,000 | $418,500 | $31,800 | $450,300 | $651,000 | $48,200 | $700,000 | $629,000 | $22,700 | $651,700 | | | | | | | | | |
| Stage Vi-1 | $8,600,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stage Vi-2 | $3,850,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stage V-3 | $2,455,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stage V-2 | $6,814,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wetland Mitigation* | $1,200,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stage III Remediation2 | $2,400,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Landscaping 2 | $1,797,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pump Station 2 | $8,475,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RECREATION Z** | **Total** | **9,462,714** | **937,286** | **10,400,000** | **7,703,422** | **1,152,273** | **8,855,595** | **6,988,185** | **350,610** | **5,038,801** | **4,041,788** | **211,861** | **4,253,649** | **3,131,729** | **237,781** | **3,161,378** | **212,232,547** | **17,707,678** | **19,333,352** |

*This wetland mitigation is being done on project lands.

### Burr Street Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Construction and Design</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Available Fed</th>
<th>Required Fed</th>
<th>Non-Fed %</th>
<th>Fed %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street Budget</td>
<td>$4,840,000</td>
<td>$484,000</td>
<td>$963,000</td>
<td>$5,867,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$2,367,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Fed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,440,176</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCE COMMITTEE AGENDA
12:00 p.m. Thursday, October 10, 2002
Country Lounge
Hobart, IN

   A. Amounts listed by line item – COE capability schedule
   B. Key Dates – Legislative Session
   C. Legislative Contacts/Strategy
   D. *Need to Develop “Local Contribution” Strategy

2. Commission Year-end Financial Forecast
   A. Year-end Financial Projections
   B. NIRPC Administration/Contract Employees Status
      • Renewal discussions
   C. 2003 Budget Preparation
      • Assumptions
      • Strategy
      • Potential Revenue Sources

3. Chairman Tanke’s remarks regarding Wednesday, October 16 Retreat meeting

4. Other Issues
October 1, 2002

Ms. Marilyn Schultz
State Budget Director
State Budget Agency
212 State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Ms. Schultz:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission respectfully submits a capital funding request in the 2003-2005 State biennial budget of $7 million. This amount of new capital money is needed in addition to the $2.5 million restored from the 2001-03 capital budget to meet the Federal construction capability supported by Congressman Pete Visclosky.

The requested State capital appropriation would be spent on targeted priority project categories that have been set through discussions with the Corps of Engineers, Congressman Visclosky’s office, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and Governor O’Bannon’s representatives. The dollars requested would go toward federally-credited items of needed non-federal participation to (1) obtain a Department of Natural Resources “construction in a floodway permit” for the entire five mile remaining reach of the project (covering the communities of Hammond, Highland and Munster); and (2) accomplish maximum property acquisition and utility relocations to spend for flood control construction the $21,054,300 the Corps of Engineers has earmarked for Federal fiscal Years 2003, 2004, and 2005 – the period covered by this State biennium.

The Development Commission clearly recognizes and appreciates the State’s fiscal situation; but we feel funding for this project would leverage significant Federal construction monies, move significantly toward completing a project all acknowledge has extended too long (which causes increased project costs), and provide construction jobs and needed flood protection to over 7,000 homes, businesses and institutions in the heavily developed I-80/94 corridor.
At the direction of the State Budget Committee, the Development Commission is pursuing local contributions to assist in the non-federal costs of the project. We can assure you that the Development Commission and the local municipalities are sensitive to the financial situation and are committed to bringing local resources to supplement the State funding. To document this commitment, listed below are the ongoing initiatives and the estimated local dollar contributions.

A. Burr Street Betterment Levee, Phase 2 – Gary

**Description:** Compilation of last segment of levee in Gary. Not COE creditable due to “betterment”.

**Action:** Mayor Scott King of Gary is pursuing use of $2,300,000+ of 2003 city casino revenue to complete non-federal commitment, which would finish the east reach of the project; allow the City of Gary to be removed from the floodplain; access $2,700,000 of federal construction monies; and fulfill a major piece toward obtaining a west reach “construction in a floodway” permit.

**Local Contribution:** $2,300,000+

B. West Reach Public Property Donation (Stages VI-1 and VI-2)

**Description:** The property needed for the west reach of the project includes several hundred acres owned by the Hammond Park Board and the Town of Highland.

**Action:** To approach each municipality to “donate” at no cost the rights of entry and use of the several hundred public acres. The property has just been appraised and the value of the land will be credited to the non-federal share.

**Local Contribution:**
- Hammond - + 10 acres - $242,000
- Highland - 160 acres - $270,000

Total $512,000

C. Highland/Hammond/Gary Pump Stations Operation

**Description:** The Development Commission has an agreement with the Town of Highland for operation and maintenance of 2 pump station facilities. We are now working on a similar agreement for the city of Hammond for operation of their pump stations. Also, Gary Sanitary District is in final negotiations to do the same for their pump stations.

**Local Contribution:** A savings of some $20,000/station or several hundred thousand dollars of local commitments will be made by the local sanitary districts.
In summary, the Development Commission is requesting the $7 million new capital funds and access to the $2.5 million from the 2001-2003 state to meet the federal construction capability of $21,054,800 in the period of the next state biennial budget. To clearly identify where the requested dollars would be spent, the following categories are earmarked. All categories are federally creditable.

**BUDGET REQUEST CATEGORIES**

- **Project Mitigation Acquisition**
  - 13 tracts – 33½ acres
  - $1,100,000

- **Project West Reach Land Acquisition**
  - Stage VI-1 - 17 residential, 20 businesses
  - Stage VI-2 - 10 residential
  - Stage V-2 - 19 residential, 6 businesses
  - Stage V-3 - 1 corporate, 1 railroad
  - $4,400,000

- **Utility Relocations**
  - 109 utility relocations
  - $2,000,000

- **Professional Services to Accomplish Acquisitions/Relocations**
  - $700,000

- **Non-Federal Cash Contribution (7% of Federal construction)**
  - $1,300,000

**TOTAL NEED**

- $9,500,000

Attached for further documentation is the spreadsheet showing Corps of Engineers spending over the next three Federal Fiscal years with the non-federal requirements also listed.

Members of the Development Commission stand ready to come to Indianapolis to explain this submission or testify to any budget hearings. Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

Encl.
Cc: Congressman Visclosky's Office
    Senator Lugar's Office
    Senator Bayh's Office
    N.W. IN State Legislative delegation
    Jeff Violi, Governor's Office
    Beth Compton, Governor's Office
    Sean Fahey, IDNR
# Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project

## Projected Federal and Non-Federal Funding Required for Fiscal Years 2003, 2004 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-Sep-02 Contract</th>
<th>Total Contract Cost</th>
<th>FY 03</th>
<th>1060-803</th>
<th>FY 04</th>
<th>1000-804</th>
<th>FY 05</th>
<th>1004-805</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Reach Reserv.</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV-1 North</td>
<td>$3,019,611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV-1 South</td>
<td>$4,266,494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 1</td>
<td>$2,169,452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 2</td>
<td>$2,070,547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1A</td>
<td>$2,714,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1 B</td>
<td>$2,041,156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 4th Pump Bld.</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Labor - Prof.</td>
<td>$651,050</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E Contracts</td>
<td>$1,593,020</td>
<td>$132,950</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,010</td>
<td></td>
<td>$143,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-1</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-3</td>
<td>$2,458,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$3,019,611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation*</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation-Hobart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Stage II Rem.</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping 2</td>
<td>$1,717,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 2</td>
<td>$6,478,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This wetland mitigation is being done on project lands

### Burr Street Budget

- Construction: $4,840,000
- Engineering and Design: $484,000
- Total: $5,324,000

**Non-Federal Costs**

- 613,300
- 504,000
- 76,700 (Grace St. Pump Stations)

### Burr Street Budget

- 41,000
- 43,000
- 47%
- 50%

### Notes

The non federal costs are shown by category in the 2nd year of the biennium for clarity.
In the News

Congressman Pete Visclosky
Proudly Representing Indiana’s 1st Congressional District
2313 Rayburn Building        701 East 83rd Avenue, Suite 9
Washington, D.C. 20515       Merrillville, IN 46410
http://www.house.gov/visclosky

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 25, 2002

WATER PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE
Committee agrees that nearly $240 million in federal funding should be authorized for flood control, sewers, and ecosystem repairs in Northwest Indiana

Washington, D.C. – Congressman Pete Visclosky (D-Merrillville) has received committee approval for provisions in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) for 2002 that will authorize $239,446,000 in federal spending on five water projects in Northwest Indiana.

The new language, reported out of the U.S. House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, authorizes $186,300,000 in spending for the Little Calumet River flood control project; $23,146,000 for the Cady Marsh Ditch flood control project; and $30 million for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction. It also authorizes a modification to credit the City of Hammond for work already done toward ecosystem restoration at Wolf Lake; and a waiver of cost-sharing requirements for ecosystem restoration at Long Lake. WRDA now goes before the full House of Representatives for passage.

In the case of the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch flood-control projects, current estimated project costs exceed the original limits, and if not adjusted, they could delay vital flood protection in the communities along the Little Calumet.

“Both the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch projects are of the utmost importance to protect Northwest Indiana residents from flooding,” Visclosky said. “These additional authorizations will help guard residents from life-threatening floods and costly property damage.”

The increased authorization for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction adds on to $10 million authorized in WRDA in 1998 for non-federal interests requiring infrastructure needs in the First Congressional District. Funding will go to upgrade sewer systems that are at or beyond their service lives of 40-50 years; sewers of that age often have reduced flow capacity and cave-ins that lead to overflows. The additional authorization reflects redistricting, which more than doubled the geographical size of the district, and will be used in Lake, Porter, Jasper, Newton, and Benton counties.

The modifications for Wolf Lake would credit the City of Hammond for work already done on the

site. Due to the fact that necessary legal agreements have not been finalized, the city can not receive credit without these adjustments.

Work at Wolf Lake will help reduce excessive exotic plant growth, renew diversity of plant and fish species, deepen the lake, restore water quality and aquatic habitat, and mitigate contaminants. Work at Long Lake will also involve restoration of the natural ecosystem, which was altered with the construction of U.S. 12.

"The funding authorization included today in the WRDA bill will help protect homes and renew the environment," Visclosky said. "These are both important goals that will help improve the quality of life for all Northwest Indiana residents."

###
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9/26/2002
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>6 MONTH UNALLOCATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
<td>11,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>1,102.33</td>
<td>670.33</td>
<td>1,522.33</td>
<td>337.33</td>
<td>1,318.33</td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
<td>2,253.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,166.68</td>
<td>9,877.00</td>
<td>9,953.97</td>
<td>11,083.65</td>
<td>10,038.82</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
<td>60,295.74</td>
<td>64,704.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,993.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>14,292.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>356.03</td>
<td>391.21</td>
<td>554.13</td>
<td>365.78</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>304.23</td>
<td>2,130.82</td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>98.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>59.08</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>832.29</td>
<td>1,005.20</td>
<td>6,994.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>7,875.89</td>
<td>6,320.57</td>
<td>6,146.94</td>
<td>8,282.77</td>
<td>5,205.87</td>
<td>4,287.43</td>
<td>38,119.47</td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>24,865.61</td>
<td>39,996.25</td>
<td>31,588.45</td>
<td>28,835.44</td>
<td>35,610.73</td>
<td>46,326.16</td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5826 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>3,170,188.00</td>
<td>2,275.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>5,133.74</td>
<td>14,071.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,280.09</td>
<td>3,143,907.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,210.50</td>
<td>1,968.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62,507.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>760.54</td>
<td>62,267.54</td>
<td>136,732.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,486,188.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,638.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,389.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,031.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,177.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,403.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,087.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>442,727.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,043,460.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>12 MONTH UNALLOCATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>4,850.00</td>
<td>11,150.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>697.33</td>
<td>526.33</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>7,753.47</td>
<td>746.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,887.63</td>
<td>10,157.58</td>
<td>10,570.11</td>
<td>90,911.06</td>
<td>34,088.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>608.87</td>
<td>4,391.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>616.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,747.13</td>
<td>4,252.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>3,841.60</td>
<td>6,029.30</td>
<td>5,733.80</td>
<td>53,724.17</td>
<td>71,275.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>32,430.19</td>
<td>33,716.95</td>
<td>65,506.75</td>
<td>338,876.53</td>
<td>161,123.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>3,170,188.00</td>
<td>11,186.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,466.29</td>
<td>3,132,721.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>2,233.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65,501.24</td>
<td>134,498.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,486,188.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,604.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,656.22</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,911.47</strong></td>
<td><strong>640,900.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,845,287.99</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2002
CHECKING ACCOUNT
LAND ACQUISITION 14,521.85
GENERAL FUND 171,723.88
TAX FUND 0.00
INVESTMENTS 1,530,359.10
ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 100.57

1,716,775.40

RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - AUGUST 31, 2002
LEASE RENT 35,060.00
INTEREST INCOME (FROM CHECKING & FIRST NATL.) 15,092.01
LAND ACQUISITION 504,160.87
ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 620.64
MISC. INCOME
PAYBACK FROM MONEY MARKET 329.00
AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE 7,234.57
INDIANA TITLE INS COMPANY 231.99
KRCB REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE 1,281.38
PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS 1,400.00
CITY OF N. NIMETZ 1,500.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS 566,460.26

DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - AUGUST 31, 2002
ADMINISTRATIVE
2001 EXPENSES PAID IN 2002 94,996.71
PER DIEM 7,559.00
LEGAL SERVICES 7,380.14
NRPC 89,795.49
TRAVEL & MileAGE 1,699.04
PRINTING & ADVERTISING 608.92
BONDS & INSURANCE 5,970.75
TELEPHONE EXPENSE 4,053.91
MEETING EXPENSE 2,536.00

451,343.94
LAND ACQUISITION
LEGAL SERVICES 49,346.07
APPRaisal SERVICES 47,400.00
ENGINEERING SERVICES 53,469.64
LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL 34,543.00
FACILITIES/PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES 6,255.00
OPERATIONS SERVICES 0.00
LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 145,143.94
SURVEYING SERVICES 7,945.00
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES 0.00
ECONOMIC/MArKETING SOURCES 280.00
PROPERTY & STRUCTURE COSTS 33,100.82
MOVING ALLOCATION 0.00
TAXES 5,521.35
PROPERTY & STRUCTURES INSURANCE 0.00
UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES 68,899.46
LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT 329.00
STRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS 345.00
BANK CHARGES MERCANTILE 34.25
LOBBY MONEY MARKET PAYBACK 26,178.30
TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS 601,583.32

CASH POSITION - AUGUST 31, 2002
CHECKING ACCOUNT
LAND ACQUISITION 83,787.34
GENERAL FUND 66,326.69
TAX FUND

INVESTMENTS
FIRST NATIONAL BANK 700,000.00 4/26/2003
(BASE CAPITAL INVESTMENT)
FIRST NATIONAL BANK 258,000.00 10/25/2002
(BASE INTEREST/RENTAL INVESTMENT)

BANK ONE 155,448.12 MONEY MARKET
(GOODS MONEYS)
BANK ONE 140,832.61 MONEY MARKET
(MARKET AND MONEYS)
BANK ONE 25,474.39 MONEY MARKET
(STATE DRAW MONEYS)
BANK ONE 283,340.73 MONEY MARKET
(GAST PAGES & RECEIVABLES)

TOTAL INVESTMENTS 1,583,095.85

ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST AVAILABLE 731.21

1,733,941.09
PROPOSED PRIORITIES FOR USE OF 2001-03 STATE BUDGET DOLLARS
15 MONTH SCHEDULE (May, 2002 thru August, 2003)
Revised: October 3, 2002

$1,761,439  Cash to draw upon currently available from the $3 million State Budget funds
- 400,000  Administration costs (Jim Pokrajac, Judy Vamos, Lorraine Kray, Sandy Mordus,
               Lou Casale, Jim Flora) Expended to date $155,049.67
$1,361,439
- 266,000  COE escrow payment due October, 2002 (7% Cash contribution) Expended to date $266,000
$1,095,439
- 250,000  Estimate for mitigation costs (Figure ½ of $500,000 earlier committed.
               Needed for “good faith effort”) Expended to date $9,259

$  845,439
- 25,000  Burr Street acquisition committed. Offers in process. Expended to date $4585.61
$  820,439
- 700,000  Kennedy Industrial Park property acquisition (VI-1) – (20 parcels) Expended to date $71,768
$  120,439
- 75,000  Utility relocation engineering money (VI-1 & VI-2) – (approx. 16 relocates) Expended to date $385
$  45,439
- 45,439  Estimate of ongoing title work costs for crediting purposes Expended to date $36,359
- 0-    Items not included in budget Expended to date $114,340.88

Total expenditures to date as of 9/5/02 .............. $657,747.16

Remaining monies available for drawdown as of 9/5/02 ........ $1,122,437

____________________________________________________

REMAINING $2.5 MILLION CURRENTLY REVISED BY GOVERNOR O’BANNON
FROM BUILD INDIANA FUNDS FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

(-378,000)  Estimate of actual utility relocation work (VI-1 & VI-2)
(- 70,000)   Clean-up of remaining properties in East Reach & East Reach Remediation area
(- 50,000)   Burr Street property acquisition costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
(-100,000)   Burr Street utility relocation costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
(-1,900,000) Burr Street Phase 2 construction cost (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)
(-2,498,000) Total commitments from $2.5 million in budget revision
Money Market Account 8805 – LEL monies  
Account opened 7/18/01  
Balance in account as of October 10, 2002 - $189,178.09

2 lease options with LEL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease Option Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$45,460 (upon signing of lease-9/99)</td>
<td>$21,500 (rec’d 12/98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,460 (rec’d 9/00)</td>
<td>$21,500 (rec’d 12/99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$42,660 (rec’d 9/01 – lease reduced because handicapped park property was taken out of original lease)</td>
<td>$21,500 (rec’d 12/00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21,500 (rec’d 12/01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $72,732 was paid out to Don Walsh & Assoc. for playground equipment at Charles Agnew Handicapped Park on 8/8/01
- $4,300 was paid out to Precision Lawn Care for O&M on 11/13/01
- $2,180 was paid out to South Shore Marina (beaver dam removal) for O&M on 5/6/02
- $26,178.50 was paid out to Valparaiso Insurance Professionals (land liability insurance) on 5/17/02  
  (Subsequently, it was paid back into the account on 6/14/02 when state draw was received.)
- $1,313 was paid out to South Shore Marina (O&M) on 6/13/02
- $329 was paid out to Don Powers Inc. (property insurance for Gerry Street rental) on 7/15/02
- $6,000 was paid out to C&H Mowing (O&M) on 8/16/02
- $150 was paid out to South Shore Marina (installation of No Trespassing signs) for O&M on 9/10/02
- $650 was paid out to Congress Enterprise (3117 Tompkins cleanup) for O&M on 9/27/02
- $3,000 was paid out to Professional Appraisal Services (cost of 2 invoices for appraisal of Chase St. property & Berkheimer land) on 10/10/02

Interest earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July, 2001</td>
<td>$258.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2001</td>
<td>$410.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2001</td>
<td>$430.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2001</td>
<td>$509.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>$486.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2001</td>
<td>$412.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2002</td>
<td>$309.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>$232.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2002</td>
<td>$239.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>$230.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2002</td>
<td>$208.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2002</td>
<td>$171.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 2002</td>
<td>$196.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2002</td>
<td>$196.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2002</td>
<td>$219.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest money earned $4,514.29
Sandy Mordus

From: "Samara, Imad LRC" <imad.samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
To: "Little Calumet (E-mail)" <littlecal@nirpc.org>
Cc: "Davis, Susanne J LRC" <susanne.j.davis@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 4:31 PM
Subject: FW: IN USGS

Dan, good afternoon, as you can see below Sue has been coordinating with the USGS and now the cost has been reduced to $5,470. It is essential for the operation of this project that the Hart Ditch USGS station be maintained. I ask that your commission find a way to fund this station. I know that LEL Lease provides funds for the O&M Operation and this is an essential part of the O&M of this project. Please call me if we need to discuss this further. I should be in the office tomorrow and Friday.

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606
312-353-6400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256

-----Original Message-----
From: Davis, Susanne J LRC
Sent: Wednesday, October 09, 2002 1:59 PM
To: Samara, Imad LRC
Subject: FW: IN USGS

Imad

Can you please work this issue with Dan Gardner. It is very important that the USGS continue to provide both flow and stage at the gage at Hart Ditch at Munster. Dan's total bill of $17K included the Little Cal at Gary which will no longer be supported. The cost to maintain flow at HD at Munster is shown below at $5470.

Time is of the essence. We need to get back with the USGS ASAP.

Sue

-----Original Message-----
From: Panganiban, John T LRC
Sent: Wednesday, October 02, 2002 1:48 PM
To: Davis, Susanne J LRC
Cc: Fogarty, Thomas J LRC
Subject: IN USGS

Sue,

I was able to speak to James Stewart, USGS-IN, about the Hart Ditch gage at Munster.

He said the IN River Basin Commission (RBC) decided to drop their support to this gage. IN-RBC support included USGS flow measurements and rating table etc. in addition to the Stage capability. James said if the IN-RBC support is stopped this particular gage will default to Stage only gage. Now if we would want to have flow measurements and rating curves available, James said it would cost us to support it for the amount of $5,470.00.

Let me know your decision and if you want me to contact him. Or if you need further information you can call him at (317) 290-3333 ext 153.

10/9/2002
Chairman Bill Tanke
Issues for Discussion at Retreat Meeting
To be held October 16, 2002

1. Future of Commission
2. Funding vs No Funding
3. Employees – Plan
4. How do we maintain?
5. Corps relationship
6. Need written plan
7. Discussions – Full Commission vs Committee

Items need discussion NOW.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Jim Pokrajac</strong></th>
<th><strong>Judy Vamos</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50.75</td>
<td>$36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 40</td>
<td>x 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,030</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x 52</td>
<td>x 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105,560</td>
<td>$75,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate for 1 year</td>
<td>Estimate for 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monies paid out first 6 months of 2002:**

<p>| <strong>Jim Pokrajac</strong> | $52,526 |
| <strong>Judy Vamos</strong>   | $36,080 |
| <strong>Lorraine Kray</strong>| $9,390  |
| <strong>Sandy Mordus</strong> | $4,104  |
| <strong>Lou Casale</strong>   | $38,120 (Land Acq. only) |
| <strong>Jim Flora</strong>    | $20,333 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2001</td>
<td>#7047</td>
<td>3,163.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2001</td>
<td>#7103</td>
<td>4,436.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2001</td>
<td>#7103</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2001</td>
<td>#7131</td>
<td>1,063.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/26/2001</td>
<td>#7131</td>
<td>1,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2001</td>
<td>#7178</td>
<td>12,531.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2001</td>
<td>#7178</td>
<td>202.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/12/2001</td>
<td>#7231</td>
<td>4,841.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2001</td>
<td>#7276</td>
<td>1,309.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2001</td>
<td>#7276</td>
<td>472.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/2001</td>
<td>#7325</td>
<td>6,422.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/2001</td>
<td>#7347</td>
<td>753.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2001</td>
<td>#7364</td>
<td>1,162.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8/2002</td>
<td>#7418</td>
<td>10,673.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/2002</td>
<td>#7433</td>
<td>5,025.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
53,365.39
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Check#</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7040</td>
<td>3,907.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7070</td>
<td>5,670.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/5/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7099</td>
<td>6,963.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/3/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7141</td>
<td>4,430.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7172</td>
<td>6,606.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7220</td>
<td>6,315.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7260</td>
<td>3,965.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/12/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7290</td>
<td>7,949.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7317</td>
<td>2,954.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7343</td>
<td>5,941.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/8/2001</td>
<td>Ck#7376</td>
<td>6,214.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/2002</td>
<td>CK#7404</td>
<td>7,285.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 68,204.34
CUSTOMER RECEIPT

First National Bank, Valparaiso, Custody Services Unit

The within acknowledgement is evidence that the said Repurchase Agreement # 4014 herein described is
now held in safekeeping at First National Bank, Valparaiso.
Pledged $262,000.00 US Treasury Note 7.50 % Due: 11-15-16 CUSIP# 912810-DX-3-3 Held in
safekeeping at Northern Trust MV 118 19

Little Calumet River Basin Development
Commission
6100 Southport Rd
Portage, IN 46368
Kim Banas

PRINCIPAL: $258,000.00
RATE: 3.00/3.02 APY%
INTEREST: $3,859.39
TERM: 182 days
SETTLEMENT DATE: 4/26/02
DUE DATE: 10/25/02

Disclosure Notice

Bank Regulations require us to furnish you with the following information regarding your Retail
Repurchase Agreement.

1. The Retail Repurchase Agreement is an obligation of First National Bank, Valparaiso and the
underlying security stated on the retail Repurchase Agreement serves as collateral.
2. First National Bank, Valparaiso will pay a fixed amount, including interest on the purchase price,
regardless of any fluctuation in the market price of underlying security.
3. The interest rate paid is not that of the underlying security.
4. General banking assets will most likely be used to satisfy the bank’s obligation under the Retail
Repurchase Agreements rather than the proceeds from the sale of the underlying security.
5. A retail repurchase Agreement is not a deposit, is not FDIC insured, and is not guaranteed in any way
by the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.
6. You may become an unsecured creditor of First National Bank, Valparaiso to the extent the market
value of the underlying security falls below the amount of the funds invested.
7. If a Retail Repurchase Agreement is redeemed prior to maturity, forfeiture of all interest earned on the
amount withdrawn will occur.
8. In the event collateral must be substituted you will be promptly advised.

Additional Required Disclosure Notice

The (seller) is not permitted to substitute other securities for those subject to this agreement and therefore
must keep the (buyer’s) securities segregated at all times, unless in this agreement the (buyer) grants the
(seller) the right to substitute other securities. If the (buyer) grants the right to substitute, this means that the
(buyer’s) securities will likely be commingled with the (seller’s) own securities during the trade day. The
(buyer) is advised that, during any trading day that the (buyer’s) securities are commingled with the
(seller’s) security, they may be subject to liens granted by the (seller) to third parties and may be used by
the (seller) for deliveries on other securities transactions. Whenever the securities are commingled, the
(seller’s) ability to resegregate substitute securities for the (buyer) will be subject to (seller’s) ability to
satisfy any lien or to obtain substitute securities.
CUSTOMER RECEIPT  Not Negotiable
First National Bank, Valparaiso, Custody Services Unit

The within acknowledgement is evidence that the said Repurchase Agreement # 4015 herein described is now held in safekeeping at First National Bank, Valparaiso.
Pledged $724,000.00 US Treasury Note 8.125 % Due: 8-15-19 CUSIP# 912810-ED-6-7 Held in safekeeping at Northern Trust MV126.03

Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd
Portage, IN 46368
Kim Banas

PRINCIPAL: $700,000.00
RATE: 3.45/3.50 APY%
INTEREST: $5,954.79 quarterly
TERM: 1 year
SETTLEMENT DATE: 4/26/02
DUE DATE: 4/26/03

Disclosure Notice
Bank Regulations require us to furnish you with the following information regarding your Retail Repurchase Agreement.

1. The Retail Repurchase Agreement is an obligation of First National Bank, Valparaiso and the underlying security stated on the retail Repurchase Agreement serves as collateral.
2. First National Bank, Valparaiso will pay a fixed amount, including interest on the purchase price, regardless of any fluctuation in the market price of underlying security.
3. The interest rate paid is not that of the underlying security.
4. General banking assets will most likely be used to satisfy the bank’s obligation under the Retail Repurchase Agreements rather than the proceeds from the sale of the underlying security.
5. A retail repurchase Agreement is not a deposit, is not FDIC insured, and is not guaranteed in any way by the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.
6. You may become an unsecured creditor of First National Bank, Valparaiso to the extent the market value of the underlying security falls below the amount of the funds invested.
7. If a Retail Repurchase Agreement is redeemed prior to maturity, forfeiture of all interest earned on the amount withdrawn will occur.
8. In the event collateral must be substituted you will be promptly advised.

Additional Required Disclosure Notice
The (seller) is not permitted to substitute other securities for those subject to this agreement and therefore must keep the (buyer’s) securities segregated at all times, unless in this agreement the (buyer) grants the (seller) the right to substitute other securities. If the (buyer) grants the right to substitute, this means that the (buyer’s) securities will likely be commingled with the (seller’s) own securities during the trade day. The (buyer) is advised that, during any trading day that the (buyer’s) securities are commingled with the (seller’s) security, they may be subject to liens granted by the (seller) to third parties and may be used by the (seller) for deliveries on other securities transactions. Whenever the securities are commingled, the (seller’s) ability to resegregate substitute securities for the (buyer) will be subject to (seller’s) ability to satisfy any lien or to obtain substitute securities.
# CURRENT LEASES - 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lease</th>
<th>Lease Agreement</th>
<th>Yearly Income</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ed &amp; Tim Bult</td>
<td>$6,500 per year</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>Chase to Grant (Both sides of 35th Avenue) Amount varies with acres farmed Only interested farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Street Farm Stand</td>
<td>$1,700 per month</td>
<td>$20,400 Oct-Dec</td>
<td>Current agreement since June 18, 1997 (No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Towers</td>
<td>$1,400 per month</td>
<td>$16,800 Dec</td>
<td>Current lease since July 5, 2000 - July 5, 2005 (Increase every 5 years based on Metro Chicago Consumer Price Index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes Ameritech)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkheimer - Pd 2400 sq ft</td>
<td>$2,400 per year</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>Current lease since December 24, 1991 for $200/month No escalation clause Parking on 2.05 acres east of their building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Melinda Adams</td>
<td>$300 per month</td>
<td>$3,600 Nov-Dec</td>
<td>Current lease since May 3, 2000 (No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LAMAR signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #1050</td>
<td>$600 per year</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>West side of Grant - ½ mile south of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3475</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant - South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3480</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant - South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL YEAR LEASE INCOME** $56,900
## INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY FUND HISTORY/UTILIZATION
### GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Appropriations</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76 &amp; 76-77</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78 &amp; 78-79</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 &amp; 80-81</td>
<td>$ 1,700,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 &amp; 82-83</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983-84 &amp; 84-85)</td>
<td>$ 1,768,800</td>
<td>General Fund (Breakwater Construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 &amp; 84-85</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
<td>General Fund (General purposes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 &amp; 86-87</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 &amp; 88-89</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90 &amp; 90-91</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 &amp; 92-93</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94 &amp; 94-95</td>
<td>$ 4,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96 &amp; 96-97</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98 &amp; 98-99</td>
<td>$ 2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00 &amp; 00-01</td>
<td>$ 1,500,000</td>
<td>“Special” Build IN Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02 &amp; 02-03</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>Build IN Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

**RECEIVED TO DATE .................. $27,200,000**

($28,968,800 including breakwater monies)
## Indiana General Assembly Funding History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>LCRBDC Request</th>
<th>Amount Rec'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 &amp; 86-87</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 &amp; 88-89</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90 &amp; 90-91</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 &amp; 92-93</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94 &amp; 94-95</td>
<td>$7 million</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96 &amp; 96-97</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98 &amp; 98-99</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00 &amp; 00-01</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02 &amp; 02-03</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>$5.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td>$18.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$52 million</td>
<td>$24 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9/11/00
The table below summarizes the history of Federal funding of this project, by fiscal year, since authorization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR</th>
<th>APPROPRIATION CATEGORY</th>
<th>FISCAL YEAR ALLOCATION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE ALLOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>$367,700</td>
<td>$367,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>1,005,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>General Investigations</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>1,342,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,366,000</td>
<td>3,708,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>2,703,000</td>
<td>6,411,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,013,000</td>
<td>9,424,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>10,146,000</td>
<td>19,570,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>13,842,700</td>
<td>33,413,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>1,569,600</td>
<td>34,983,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>3,848,000</td>
<td>38,831,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>9,639,000</td>
<td>48,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,378,000</td>
<td>56,848,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>5,657,000</td>
<td>62,505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Construction General</td>
<td>8,061,000</td>
<td>70,566,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>In Appropriations Bill</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
<td>79,366,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>84,366,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 5, 2002

Mr. William Tanke
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
290 N 250 W
Valparaiso, IN 46383

HAND DELIVERED

RE: Commission Insurance

Dear Bill:

I have been asked to research whether it would be prudent for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission to cancel its liability and property insurance, as well as directors and officers liability insurance. This request was prompted by Sean Fahey’s suggestion that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission did not need insurance due to exemptions and immunities provided by the Indiana Tort Claims Immunity Act, as per legal advice provided by the Chief Legal Counsel for the Indiana Department of Natural Resources.

I have thoroughly researched the matter, and recommend that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission continue its insurance coverage as requested, I have enclosed a legal memorandum which supports the above stated conclusion.

I have discussed this matter with the Chief Legal Counsel for the Department of Natural Resources and have indicated to her that my recommendation will likely change if the Attorney General of the State of Indiana agrees, in writing, that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission should terminate insurance coverage and additionally agrees that the State of Indiana defend the Commission and pay damages and costs on its behalf for claims and judgments. I have not yet received a response to the above request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Louis M. Casale

LMC/amo
Enclosures
cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Sean Fahey, DNR

Bankruptcy • Business Litigation • Civil Rights • Creditors Rights • Construction • Corporate • Criminal Defense
Estate Planning • Government Law • Healthcare • Insurance Law • Labor & Employment • Medical Malpractice
Personal Injury • Products Liability • Real Estate • Worker's Compensation
MEMORANDUM

TO: Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
FR: Louis Casale and Joseph C. Svetanoff
RE: Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and the Indiana Tort Claims Act
DA: August 30, 2002

I was asked to do research into four different questions: (1) Can the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission decide to purchase insurance coverage on its own? (2) Does the Indiana Tort Claims Act apply to the Lake County River Basin Development Commission? (3) If the Indiana Tort Claims Act does apply to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, will it cover all tort claims that might take place? (4) Should the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission decide to maintain its insurance coverage?

(#1) Can the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission decide to purchase insurance coverage on its own?

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission ("LCRBDC") is defined by Indiana Statutory Law (§14-13-2-1 et. seq.). Under Indiana Statute §14-13-2-5, "The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission is created as a public body corporate and politic."

Under the Indiana Tort Claims Act, specifically §34-13-3-20(b)(3), "the state may not purchase insurance to cover the liability of the state or its employees. (b) This subsection does not prohibit any of the following: (3) The purchase of insurance by a separate body corporate and politic to cover the liability of itself or its employees."

The LCRBDC can select at its option to purchase insurance because of its existence as a separate body corporate and politic to cover the liability of itself or its employees.

(#2) Does the Indiana Tort Claims Act apply to the Lake County River Basin Development Commission?

The Indiana Tort Claims Act protects both governmental entities and public employees from certain tort claims action. With a thorough understanding of the definitions relating to the Indiana Tort Claims Act, one should see that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission ("LCRBDC") would probably qualify under this Act but we should be aware of the definitional sections of Indiana Statutory law. The following definitional sections have been noted:
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• The term “governmental entity” can be found under Indiana Statute §34-6-2-49 (West 2002) and defined as, “Governmental Entity...means the state or a political subdivision of the state.”

• The phrase “persons or entities deemed political subdivisions” can be found under Indiana Statute §34-13-3-22 (West 2002) and is defined as: “for purposes of this chapter, the following shall be treated as political subdivisions: (1) a community action agency... (2) an individual or corporation rendering public transportation services... (3) a volunteer fire department...”

• The term “community action agency” can be found under Indiana Statute §12-14-23-2 (West 2002) and defined as, “community action agency”...means an entity that meets the following conditions... (A) A private nonprofit organization that is geographically located within a community, (B) A private nonprofit organization that is located in a county or counties contiguous to or within reasonable proximity of a community, (C) A political subdivision...”

• The term “state” can be found under Indiana Statute §34-6-2-140 (West 2002) and defined as, “State: ...means Indiana and its state agencies...”

• The term “state agency” can be found under Indiana Statute §34-6-2-141 (West 2002) and defined as, “State agency”...means (1) a board; (2) a commission, (3) a department, (4) a division; (5) a governmental subdivision, including a soil and water conservation district; (6) a bureau; (7) a committee; (8) an authority; (9) a military body; or (10) other instrumentality of the state. However, the term does not include a political subdivision.” It is notable that the definition also does not include “public body corporate and politic.”

• The term “political subdivision” can be found under Indiana Statute §34-6-2-110 (West 2002) and defined as, “Political subdivision”...means a: (1) county; (2) township; (3) city; (4) town; (5) separate municipal corporation; (6) special taxing district; (7) state college or university; (8) city or county hospital; (9) school corporation; (10) board or commission of one (1) of the entities listed in subdivisions (1) through (9); (11) drug enforcement task force operated jointly by political subdivisions; (12) community correctional service program...; (13) solid waste management district...”

When examining the case law on the topic of the Indiana Tort Claims Act and municipal corporations the Indiana Supreme Court has adopted a simple yet effective test.

• In Greater Hammond Community Services, Inc. v. Mutka, 735 N.E.2d 780 (Ind. 2000), our Supreme Court held that a regional community service organization, which was affiliated with a community action agency, and which helped provide numerous services to disadvantaged persons, was not a “political subdivision” of state, and thus was not a “governmental entity” protected by Indiana Tort Claims Act; and, the organization was not a governmental entity or political subdivision named by statute, that did not provide uniquely governmental services, and was not a division of another governmental entity. Additionally, Mutka held that a group that is neither specifically named a political subdivision by statute nor engaged in the provision of a uniquely governmental service might not receive the protection of the Indiana Tort Claims Act.
In Metal Working Lubricants Company v. Indianapolis Water Company, 746 N.E.2d 352 (Ind. App. 2001), the Court of appeals held that ordinarily, the first step in determining governmental immunity is to look at the Tort Claims Act and decide if the entity is entitled to statutory immunity.

In conclusion, from a statutory perspective the LCRBDC probably would qualify as a governmental entity under the Indiana Tort Claims Act. In addition, the Indiana Supreme Court has adopted the Mutka test, which lays out three prongs:

1. Is the organization a governmental entity or political subdivision named by statute?

2. Does the organization provide a uniquely governmental service? or

3. Is the organization a division of another governmental entity?

The LCRBDC would most likely be considered a governmental entity or political subdivision as named by statute. The LCRBDC would be considered an organization that provides a uniquely governmental service and the Indiana Tort Claims Act would apply.

(#3) If the Indiana Tort Claims Act does apply to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission will it cover all incidents that might take place?

The Indiana Tort Claims Act protects both governmental entities and public employees from certain tort claims action. Under Indiana Statute §34-13-3-3 (West 2002), a specific listing exists that would allow a governmental entity or an employee acting within the scope of the employee’s employment to escape liability for tortuous acts committed. This listing, even though extensive, does not rule out every tort claims scenario that could occur. The following are a few examples of cases related to this subject:

- Mangold v. Indiana Department of Natural Resources, 756 N.E.2d 970 (Ind. 2001), our Supreme Court held that the Indiana Tort Claims Act allows for the commencement of suits against governmental entities for torts committed by their employees, but grants immunity under specific circumstances. Additionally, the Court held that whether a governmental entity is immune from liability under the Indiana Tort Claims Act is a question of law for the court to decide.

- Richardson v. Salaam, 726 N.E.2d 888 (Ind. App. 2000), the Appellate Court held that governmental entities can be liable for tortuous conduct unless the conduct is within the immunity granted in the Indiana Tort Claims Act.

- City of Wakarusa v. Holdeman, 582 N.E.2d 802 (Ind. 1991), the Supreme Court held that deputy marshal who was on patrol for license plate violations when he rear-ended another automobile was not “enforcing law” within meaning of Indiana Tort Claims Act and thus, he was not immune from liability for the collision.
• *Scott v. City of Seymour*, 659 N.E.2d 585 (Ind.Ct.App. 1995), the Appellate Court held that any failure by city to maintain and repair area of street where plaintiff fell and was injured was not entitled to discretionary immunity...

• *Huntley v. City of Gary*, 550 N.E.2d 790 (Ind.Ct.App. 1990), the Appellate Court held that State Tort Claims Act did not provide governmental immunity to city and ambulance driver who was involved in automobile-ambulance collision pursuant to discretionary function immunity, even if the ambulance driver might have exercised professional judgment in driving through intersection at which the collision occurred; the ambulance driver was not engaged in formulation of basic policy decisions at the time of collision.

(#4) Should the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission decide to maintain its insurance coverage?

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission ("LCRBDC") should maintain its current insurance coverage for the following reasons:

• The LCRBDC can elect as a "public body corporate and politic" to purchase liability insurance to cover the liability of itself or its employees.

• It is clear that the LCRBDC probably does qualify as a governmental entity under the Indiana Tort Claims Act.

• The Indiana Tort Claims Act will cover certain scenarios but other possible tort claims that are not listed could occur that would not be covered by the Act.

For the reasons cited herein, I believe it is prudent to continue carrying general liability, property damage and directors and officers liability insurance.

Respectfully submitted,

Louis M. Casale
September 5, 2002

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

Dear Dan:

We enjoyed meeting with you last week to discuss land acquisition needs for the wetlands mitigation project in the Hobart Marsh area. We were impressed by the scope of the project and the commitment of the people involved. We are looking forward to assisting with property acquisition in the coming months.

We would propose to begin immediately to engage an acceptable appraiser to provide us with preliminary value information. (The Trust for Public Land would pay for this work.) We would also work with Judy Vamos to identify one or two local volunteers that would be willing to introduce us to landowners in the Hobart Marsh area. While preliminary appraisal work is underway, we would gather additional information and develop a strategy to complete a simultaneous acquisition. Initial meetings with property owners would occur at the end of this year and the beginning of 2003.

If you need additional information or have any questions, please feel free to call me or Mike McCurdy.

Sincerely

Chris Slattery
Director
Chicago Office

Cc: Mike McCurdy, Project Manager
    Al Raymond, Director of Projects
In the News

Congressman Pete Visclosky

Proudly Representing Indiana's 1st Congressional District

2313 Rayburn Building 701 East 83rd Avenue, Suite 9
Washington, D.C. 20515 Merrillville, IN 46410
http://www.house.gov/visclosky

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 25, 2002

WATER PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS REPORTED OUT OF COMMITTEE

Committee agrees that nearly $240 million in federal funding should be authorized for flood control, sewers, and ecosystem repairs in Northwest Indiana

Washington, D.C. — Congressman Pete Visclosky (D-Merrillville) has received committee approval for provisions in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) for 2002 that will authorize $239,446,000 in federal spending on five water projects in Northwest Indiana.

The new language, reported out of the U.S. House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, authorizes $186,300,000 in spending for the Little Calumet River flood control project; $23,146,000 for the Cady Marsh Ditch flood control project; and $30 million for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction. It also authorizes a modification to credit the City of Hammond for work already done toward ecosystem restoration at Wolf Lake; and a waiver of cost-sharing requirements for ecosystem restoration at Long Lake. WRDA now goes before the full House of Representatives for passage.

In the case of the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch flood-control projects, current estimated project costs exceed the original limits, and if not adjusted, they could delay vital flood protection in the communities along the Little Calumet.

"Both the Little Calumet River and Cady Marsh Ditch projects are of the utmost importance to protect Northwest Indiana residents from flooding," Visclosky said. "These additional authorizations will help guard residents from life-threatening floods and costly property damage."

The increased authorization for sewer technical planning, design assistance, and construction adds on to $10 million authorized in WRDA in 1998 for non-federal interests requiring infrastructure needs in the First Congressional District. Funding will go to upgrade sewer systems that are at or beyond their service lives of 40-50 years; sewers of that age often have reduced flow capacity and cave-ins that lead to overflows. The additional authorization reflects redistricting, which more than doubled the geographical size of the district, and will be used in Lake, Porter, Jasper, Newton, and Benton counties.

The modifications for Wolf Lake would credit the City of Hammond for work already done on the

site. Due to the fact that necessary legal agreements have not been finalized, the city cannot receive credit without these adjustments.

Work at Wolf Lake will help reduce excessive exotic plant growth, renew diversity of plant and fish species, deepen the lake, restore water quality and aquatic habitat, and mitigate contaminants. Work at Long Lake will also involve restoration of the natural ecosystem, which was altered with the construction of U.S. 12.

"The funding authorization included today in the WRDA bill will help protect homes and renew the environment," Visclosky said. "These are both important goals that will help improve the quality of life for all Northwest Indiana residents."

###
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Press Release List
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION  
FINANCIAL STATEMENT  
JANUARY 1, 2002 - AUGUST 31, 2002

CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2002

CHECKING ACCOUNT
- LAND ACQUISITION 1,521.85
- GENERAL FUND 171,755.88
- TAX FUND 0.00
- INVESTMENTS 1,530,390.10
- ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 150.57

1,716,772.40

RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - AUGUST 31, 2002

LEASE RENTS 35,000.00
INTEREST INCOME (FROM CHECKING & FIRST NATL) 15,000.00
LAND ACQUISITION 596,160.62
ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST 650.64
MISC. INCOME
- PAYBACK FROM MONEY MARKET 329.00
- AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE 7,334.57
- INDIANA TITLE INS COMPANY 231.99
KRBC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE 1,281.38
PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS 1,500.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS 666,460.76

DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - AUGUST 31, 2002

ADMINISTRATIVE
- 2001 EXPENSES PAID IN 2002 94,996.71
- PER DIEM 7,550.00
- LEGAL SERVICES 7,380.14
- NRPC 89,795.49
- TRAVEL & MILEAGE 1,659.04
- PRINTING & ADVERTISING 608.62
- BONDS & INSURANCE 6,070.75
- TELEPHONE EXPENSE 5,035.91
- MEETING EXPENSE 2,536.03
- LAND ACQUISITION 49,246.07
- APPRAISAL SERVICES 47,400.00
- ENGINEERING SERVICES 55,469.64
- LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL 24,543.00
- FACILITIES/PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES 8,555.00
- OPERATIONS SERVICES 0.00
- LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 145,543.04
- SURVEYING SERVICES 7,945.00
- MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES 0.00
- ECONOMIC/CONTRACTING SOURCES 380.00
- PROPERTY & STRUCTURE COSTS 33,100.82
- MOVING ALLOCATION 0.00
- TAXES 6,521.35
- PROPERTY & STRUCTURES INSURANCE 0.00
- UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES 68,899.45
- LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT 329.00
- STRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS 345.00
- BANK CHARGES MERCANTILE 34.25
- LCRBC MONEY MARKET PAYBACK 26,178.56
- TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS 661,587.32

CASH POSITION - AUGUST 31, 2002

CHECKING ACCOUNT
- LAND ACQUISITION
- GENERAL FUND 66,336.69
- TAX FUND

INVESTMENTS
- FIRST NATIONAL BANK 700,000.00 4/26/2003
- (BASE CAPITAL INVESTMENT)
- FIRST NATIONAL BANK 258,000.00 10/26/2002
- (MISC/INTEREST/RENTAL INVESTMENT)

BANK ONE 155,448.12 4/26/2003
BANK ONE 70,000.00 10/26/2002
BANK ONE 140,832.61
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 35,474.38
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 140,795.53
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 283,940.73
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 35,474.38
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 1,582,098.85
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 283,940.73
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 1,582,098.85
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 283,940.73
- (MONEY MARKET)
BANK ONE 1,582,098.85
- (MONEY MARKET)

TOTAL INVESTMENTS 1,582,098.85

ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST AVAILABLE 781.24

1,733,941.09
## Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
### Monthly Budget Report, September 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE ALLOCATED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
<td>11,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>1,102.33</td>
<td>670.33</td>
<td>1,522.33</td>
<td>337.33</td>
<td>1,318.33</td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
<td>2,253.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,166.68</td>
<td>9,877.00</td>
<td>9,953.97</td>
<td>11,083.65</td>
<td>10,038.82</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
<td>60,295.74</td>
<td>64,704.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>153.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>205.56</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>355.88</td>
<td>730.60</td>
<td>13,269.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>465.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>522.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,933.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>356.03</td>
<td>391.21</td>
<td>554.13</td>
<td>365.78</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>304.23</td>
<td>2,130.82</td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>98.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>59.08</td>
<td>15.26</td>
<td>852.29</td>
<td>1,005.20</td>
<td>6,994.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>7,875.89</td>
<td>6,320.57</td>
<td>6,146.94</td>
<td>8,282.77</td>
<td>5,205.87</td>
<td>4,287.43</td>
<td>38,119.47</td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>24,865.61</td>
<td>39,996.25</td>
<td>31,588.45</td>
<td>28,835.44</td>
<td>35,610.73</td>
<td>46,326.16</td>
<td>207,222.64</td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>3,170,188.00</td>
<td>2,273.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>5,133.74</td>
<td>14,071.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,280.90</td>
<td>3,143,907.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,210.50</td>
<td>1,968.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62,507.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>760.54</td>
<td>63,267.54</td>
<td>136,732.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>247,000.00</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>247,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>345.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>162.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL | 4,486,188.00 | 46,638.31 | 57,389.03 | 55,031.44 | 147,177.35 | 68,403.76 | 68,087.98 | 442,727.87 | 4,043,460.13 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPTEMBER</th>
<th>OCTOBER</th>
<th>NOVEMBER</th>
<th>DECEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,850.00</td>
<td>11,150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>697.33</td>
<td>526.33</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>7,753.47</td>
<td>746.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,887.63</td>
<td>10,157.58</td>
<td>10,570.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>90,911.06</td>
<td>34,088.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>131.04</td>
<td>616.52</td>
<td>2,143.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,621.58</td>
<td>10,378.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>608.87</td>
<td>4,391.13</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>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>616.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,747.13</td>
<td>4,252.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>976.16</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,082.67</td>
<td>5,917.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>3,841.60</td>
<td>6,029.30</td>
<td>5,733.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>53,724.17</td>
<td>71,275.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>32,430.19</td>
<td>33,716.95</td>
<td>68,506.75</td>
<td>68,506.75</td>
<td>338,876.53</td>
<td>161,123.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>3,170,188.00</td>
<td>11,186.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,466.29</td>
<td>3,132,721.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</td>
<td>28,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>2,233.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65,501.24</td>
<td>134,498.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>247,000.00</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>247,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL | 4,486,188.00 | 60,604.45 | 52,656.22 | 84,911.47 | 640,900.01 | 3,845,287.99 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5801</td>
<td>WILLIAM TANKE</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE IN NEW ORLEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5891</td>
<td>ROBERT MARSZALEK</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE IN NEW ORLEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811</td>
<td>CASALE WOODWARD BULS, LLP</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>RETAINER FEE BILLED FOR MONTH OF SEPTEMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>NIPRC</td>
<td>10,005.11</td>
<td>SERVICES PERFORMED AUGUST 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812</td>
<td>STATE BOARD OF ACCOUNTS</td>
<td>565.00</td>
<td>COST OF AUDIT FOR 1998-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>908.35</td>
<td>HOTEL EXPENSE FOR NAFSMA FOR R. MARSZALEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>908.35</td>
<td>HOTEL EXPENSE FOR NAFSMA FOR W. TANKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>MILEAGE 9/10/02-9/24/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>WILLIAM TANKE</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>REIMBURSEMENT FOR SHUTTLE IN NEW ORLEANS FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>ROBERT MARSZALEK</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>REIMBURSEMENT FOR SHUTTLE IN NEW ORLEANS FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>WILLIAM TANKE</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>MEAL ALLOWANCE FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE IN NEW ORLEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821</td>
<td>ROBERT MARSZALEK</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>MEAL ALLOWANCE FOR NAFSMA CONFERENCE IN NEW ORLEANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>74.06</td>
<td>EXPENSES INCURRED 9/04/02 AT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5828</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>5,733.80</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/LEGAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 9/22/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-M01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5841</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-M03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5842</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>2,445.44</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 9/13/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5543</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>365.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR VILLAGE LEASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5543</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC355A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>4,866.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES 8/16/02-8/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>180.04</td>
<td>AUGUST MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>3,704.75</td>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES 9/3/02-9/13/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>3,431.00</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION SERVICES 8/16/02-8/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>AUGUST MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>2,774.00</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION SERVICES 9/3/02-9/13/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>857.75</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIANLAND ACQUISITION ASST 8/19/02-8/29/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>629.63</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIANLAND ACQUISITION ASST 9/4/02-9/12/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>281.75</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 8/22/02-8/29/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>330.75</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 9/4/02-9/12/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 84,911.47
WORK STUDY SESSION
3 OCTOBER 2002

LAND ACQUISITION / LAND MANAGEMENT
ARLENE COLVIN, CHAIRPERSON

LAND ACQUISITION:
1.) There are no increased offers.
   There are no condemnations.

2.) Update on Hobart Marsh Mitigation:
   Trust for Public Lands visited LCRBDC on Friday 27 September 2002 to
   discuss Hobart Marsh acquisitions. We have spoken with two appraisers
   who will work with TPL starting the end of October. Trust for Public
   Lands will need a Phase I Environmental Survey. Corps has completed a
   vegetation survey (11 December 2000) and will perform the Phase I when
   we acquire the options-to-purchase. We've informed TPL and are waiting
   for their response.

   Corps has approved the first two Hobart Marsh appraisals and offers can
   be made.

3.) Charles Agnew Park Phase II:
   Playworld Systems has coordinated with River Forest Elementary School to
   begin construction of Phase II of the park. Completion in 4 to 6 weeks.

4.) One West Reach Stage VI-1 landowner has a concern about his swimming
    pool not being in compliance with state rules for maintaining a 5 ft high
    fence around the pool for safety. During levee construction the contractor
    will remove the back portion of the yard fencing and install the customary
    flexible fence. This leaves the landowner in non-compliance and liable for
    accidents in the pool. The Corps is considering several alternatives and we
    should have something in writing soon.

LAND MANAGEMENT:
1.) We recommend action to approve the following:
   Invoice from Professional Appraisal Services for two summary appraisals
   for the proposed sale of 6.45 acres of excess property to Berkheimer
   Trucking and the proposed sale or increased lease for Chase Street Farm
   Stand. Each appraisal is for $1,500 for a total of $3,000. The money will
   be taken out of LEL funds.
2.) Disposal of Property
a. Berkheimer's - Discussion.
Appraisal sets land value of 6.45 acres at $16,000. Discussion?

b. Chase Street Farm Stand – Discussion?
Appraisal sets land value of 11 acres ± at $170,000.
- Recommendation to raise the current lease of $1,700 to $2,100 based on consumer price index. There has been no increase since June of 1997. New lease agreements should have escalation clause and a 90-day termination clause.

3.) O. & M. Spreadsheet:
We have completed the breakdown for 5 completed East Reach segments. The spreadsheet is preliminary and dollar amounts are not listed. For easier understanding the spreadsheet may have to be restructured into street to street segments rather than stages and phases which were workable for flood protection construction. (Refer to Jim Flora and the handout.)
WORK STUDY SESSION
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE
October 3, 2002
Bob Huffman, Committee Chairman

1. Stage III Remediation - Bids received on September 10th
   - Dyer Construction is apparent low bidder at $1,231,845
   - COE estimate was $1,695,822 (the bid came in $463,977 under estimate)
   - Construction start anticipated in the spring of 2003

2. “In Project mitigation” bids received on September 17th.
   - Renewable Resources, Inc. apparent low bidder at $921,103
   - COE estimate was $1,017,082 (the bid came in $95,979 under estimate)
   - Construction start anticipated in the spring of 2003

3. Auxiliary power for North Burr Street pump station was reviewed with WREP on September 13, 2002.
   - LCRBDC received O&M manuals from COE, instructional was done and contractor has completed job as per COE plans & specs
   - This is part of Stage IV-2A (south of Lake Etta) and a final inspection
   - No segments or pump stations can be accepted for O&M until GSD issues are resolved.

4. A meeting is scheduled with the COE, INDOT, LCRBDC, Highland, and North Township on October 7 at 9:30 @ the Indianapolis Bridge
   - Meeting is to review proposed drainage plan from INDOT for their project adjacent to the Little Calumet River.
Hi All,

Full and open competition is a wonderful thing! Our last bid opening for this fiscal year was very successful. We received a total of four bid packages. The results of the bid opening are summarized below.

**BID RESULTS:**
**SOLICITATION NUMBER:** DACW23-02-B-0002 (Wetland Mitigation, Lil Cal)

- **Bid Opening Officer:** Regina Blair
- **Bid Opener & Reader:** Regina Blair
- **Recorder:** Linda Zamarocy

**APPARENT LOW BIDDER:** Renewable Resources, Inc.
265 Dean Road
Barnesville, GA 30204

- **Total Bid Amount:** $921,102.68

**2nd Low Bidder:** George J. Beemsterboer, Inc.
16807 South Park Avenue
South Holland, IL 60473
Total Bid Amount: $1,402,078.00

3rd Low Bidder: Dyer Construction Company, Inc.
1716 Sheffield Avenue
Dyer, IN 46311

Total Bid Amount: $1,702,441.00

4th Low Bidder: Vistas Construction of Illinois, Inc.
7400 South Stony Island Avenue
Chicago, IL 60649

Total Bid Amount: $2,271,636.46

Government Estimate Without Profit: $1,017,082.00

Carpe Diem! <<...OLE_Obj...>>

Regina G. Blair
Contracting Officer
Department of the Army
Chicago District, Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206
Telephone: (312) 353-6400 Ext. 1702
Email Address: Regina.G.Blair@lrc02.usace.army.mil
LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2002

(Information in this report is from August 28 – September 26, 2002

A. NON-PROJECT LAND MANAGEMENT
   Board voted approval at 9/5/02 meeting for completion of Phase II of Charles Agnew
   Handicapped Park, Playworld Systems representative has contacted River Forest
   Elementary School to coordinate installation this fall. Representative will supply
   samples of directional and safety signs for review.

B. Gleason Park-Driving Range
   1. Construction started on April 15th, 2002, for the area East of the parking lot and North of
      30th Ave. (Grading and seeding are currently completed.)
   2. We have started to receive invoices from the Gary Parks & Recreation Dept.

C. Lease Agreements
   1. VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER
      LCRBDC received title work for the Village Shopping Center on September 18,
      • R.W. Armstrong sent a memo on August 15th, 2002, indicating that the new, proposed
         24” line did not include flow from the Village, and that the 96” sewer on the East side
         of Grant Street would need a determination from the city.
   2. CHASE STREET FARM STAND
      An appraisal has been completed to determine the full value of this property in the
      amount of $170,000.
      • A fair market value for monthly rent was not determined, but if we would
        compare our agreements with Chicago towers (Stan Stann @ 35th & Chase), it
        would increase the existing rent approximately 4400/mo – new rent @ $2100/mo.
      • This is based upon an increase every (5) years based upon Metro Chicago
        Consumer Price Index.

D. Disposition of Property
   1. Commission members voted at the July 9th, 2002 meeting to sell the 3120 Gerry St.
      property for its appraised value of $36,000. First offer was agreed to go to current
      tenants, Mike and Melinda Adams. A letter was sent on July 22nd, 2002.
      • Tenants are having second thoughts about purchasing the property for $36,000. They
        are considering a lower counter-offer or purchasing a different home. Decisions will
        come shortly.
   2. A letter was sent to Berkheimer’s (Dale Cobble) on July 24th, 2002, informing him that
      we are now able to sell surplus property and asking him if he is still interested in
      purchasing additional property adjacent to their existing facilities so that they would be
      able to expand their business.
      • Berkheimer’s responded that they were interested in approximately 6.45 acres of
        adjacent land pending what the cost of this land would be.
      • We received an appraisal from Ed Rich in the amount of $16,000.
      • Board to review at the October 3 meeting to determine how to proceed.
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 October 2002.
   2. The LCRBDE 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. (COE is currently working on this procedure.)
      • A memo was sent to the COE on September 17, 2002 reminding the COE of the critical nature of addressing the remaining (7) items with the GSD (Refer to Item #4)
   3. LCRBDC is currently working on O&M responsibility tables to establish each task and who will do each item.
      • A spreadsheet for Gary has been completed that shows all tasks, frequency of tasks, and locations. Costs and quantities for (5) completed segments have been completed for the East Reach.
B. Emergency Management/River Monitoring
   1. 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 has been obtained by the LCRBDC and submitted to the COE to be incorporated into the final O&M submittal.
C. Portions of West Reach pump stations in Hammond and Highland have been turned over to their respective communities. Representatives of the Hammond and Highland Sanitary Districts have inspected these facilities with the COE and contractor and signed off as owner.
   1. The Inter-Local Agreement with the town of Highland has been signed, and recorded, for the 81st Street & North 5th Avenue Pump Stations.
   2. A memo was sent to Lou Casale on September 9, 2002 requesting a similar agreement be put in place with the Hammond Sanitary District for the S.E. Hessville Pump Station.
D. The late fall mowing of levees to be done by C&H Mowing.
   • A second mowing is scheduled this October in the amount of $3,500. Approval was given to do this 2nd mowing at our September 5th, 2002 meeting.

General Items
1. A letter was sent to the COE on April 8th, 2002, regarding the use of a controlled burn for completed levee segments along with information from IDEM. We feel a controlled burn is the best method of enhancing the growth of our native grasses and landscaping. (Still awaiting a response as of September 26, 2002.)
10 September 2002

Mr. Rich Arnold, President, River Forest Community School Corporation
3334 North Michigan Avenue
Hobart, IN 46342

Dear Mr. Arnold:

RE: Charles Agnew Handicapped Accessible Park

My letter today will inform you that on Thursday, 5 September 2002 the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission voted to approve the completion of the Charles Agnew Handicapped Accessible Park at River Forest Elementary School.

Phase I has been completed and today Land Acquisition Agent Judy Vamos spoke with Judee Roper, Representative of Playworld Systems, about completing Phase II. Ms. Roper informed Judy that the park could be finished this fall by coordinating construction activities with River Forest Elementary School Principal Andrew Wilgus.

Ms. Roper will contact Mr. Willis to make arrangements.

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission remains committed to the plans for the completion of the Community Center. This phase is dependent, however, upon the ability of the Lake Erie Land Company to sell permitted wetland mitigation credits. To date this has not happened as quickly as hoped. We will keep the school corporation informed as to progress in this regard.

Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner, Executive Director

cc: Robert Marszalek, River Forest School Corporation, LCRBDC
Andrew Wilgus, Principal, River Forest
Judee Roper, Representative, Playworld Systems
September 18, 2002

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

RE: Village Shopping Lease

Dear Sandy:

Enclosed please find an invoice and title report from Ticor Title Insurance Company pertaining to Village Shopping Center Drainage Easement. Please process the claim for payment.

Kindly contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

CASALE, WOODWARD & BULS, LLP

LMC/amo

Enclosures

cc: Judy Vamos  
Jim Pokrajac
MEMO

TO: Jim Pokrajac, Engineering
FROM: Judy Vamos, Land Acquisition
DATE: 24 September 2002
SUBJ: Chase Street and Berkheimer Appraisals: Leasing vs. Fee Sale Data.

My Memo today will reiterate the conclusions of the appraisal reports completed for the excess property tracts of Chase Street Produce and Berkheimer Trucking. Both appraisals were completed by Appraiser Ed Rich of Professional Appraisal Practices. Mr. Rich compared the sale price and leasing price of the tracts. Pertinent pages showing actual figures and calculations from the appraisals are attached.

**Chase Street Village Farm Stand: current lease $1,700 monthly-$20,400 annually.**
The subject property is an 11.04 acre tract, including a permanent levee easement, 10 tillable acres, and improvements of a retail warehouse building which is actually two buildings connected with a through passage. Sales Comparison and Income Approaches were both used for comparable sales of newer properties in better locations and older properties of lessor qualities resulting in a range from $15.51 to $25.00 per square foot. The appraiser concluded a land value of $18 per square foot at 9,489 square feet which equals $170,802 rounded to $170,000 fee value.

The economic benefit of leasing shows that properties similar to Chase Street realize a higher rate of return for national investors. The subject property is not considered an investment grade property because the local market is dominated by owner-occupants and it is situated in a slow growth area, however, government entities often own real estate for specific needs of the public. No lease amount is recommended.

**Berkheimer Trucking: current lease $200 monthly-$2,400 per year.**
The subject property is a horseshoe-shaped 6.45 (+) acre tract of a larger piece located on 35th Street in Gary, Indiana. The final fee value conclusion is $2,480.62 per acre rounded to $2,500 per acre or $16,000 for a fee purchase. Berkheimer Trucking has expressed an interest in purchasing the land only and not continuing a lease arrangement.

Please contact me if you have questions. Thanks.
SUBJECT: Retail/warehouse facility located at: 3499 Chase Street Gary, Indiana.

PURPOSE OF THE APPRAISAL: The purpose of the appraisal was to estimate the market value of the fee simple ownership rights of the subject property AS OF August 21, 2002.

INTENDED USE OF REPORT: For the sole purpose of estimating a market value as it relates to the possible sale of the subject property by Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, Portage, Indiana. The intended users of this report are the staff of Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission. I accept no responsibility for any use or to any user not specifically named in this report.

INTEREST VALUED: Fee Simple Interest.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE: August 21, 2002.


SCOPE OF THE APPRAISAL

The scope of the appraisal requires compliance with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice promulgated by the Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation and the Guide Notes to the Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice adopted by the Appraisal Foundation. The standards contain binding requirements and specific guidelines that deal with the procedures to be followed in developing an appraisal, analysis, or opinion. These uniform standards set the requirements to communicate the appraisers' analysis, opinions, and conclusions in a manner that will be meaningful and not misleading in the market place.

A complete summary appraisal report on the subject property has been prepared. The subject property data such as size, location, quality, and zoning are considered and presented in this report. Market data, including comparable improved sales, and supply and demand are among the items researched, analyzed, and/or presented. The data is used to consider the highest and best use of the subject property and to estimate the market value.

The appraiser lacks the knowledge and experience with respect to the detection and measurement of hazardous substances. Therefore, this assignment does not cover the presence or absence of such substances as discussed in the Standard Statement of Contingent and Limiting Conditions section of this report. However, any visual or obviously known hazardous substances affecting the property will be reported and an indication of its impact on value will be discussed.

The documentation necessary to arrive at the value is considered in this appraisal report. The market data has been collected, confirmed, and analyzed. Comparable sales were
chosen for their similar highest and best use as outlined within the report. All sales were analyzed and compared to the subject property based on their similarities and dissimilarities. The replacement costs of similar structures and income generated by equal properties have been compared. These approaches were considered and judged in reaching a final estimate of value.

DESCRIPTION OF REAL ESTATE
APPRaised: Location/Description

Gary is a residential and industrial community with support areas that include a commercial district. Vacant land is abundant in the area and the municipality is receptive to development in all economic sectors. The City of Gary has numerous manufacturing plants that line the lake front and the interstate highway system. Property values have remained basically stable over the past several years.

There is some demand for industrial units in the area, as the real estate tax in this location is inexpensive when compared to the tax and assessment levels found in southern Cook County, Illinois. Recent trends are viewed to be somewhat positive and the City of Gary is reported to be aggressively attempting to capitalize on the renewed interest in this area. Opportunity for growth in the area is also tied to the gaming developments that are located in nearby Buffington Harbor.

The area is well located and there is good access to all amenities. The confluence of Interstates 80/94, 65 and the tollway system forms a strong base for both local and regional travel. Because of these factors the outlook for this area is for continued slow growth for the foreseeable future.

The subject property is situated approximately at the northeast corner of Chase Street and 35th Avenue. The subject is located approximately 1 mile west of Grant Street and 11/4 miles south of Interstate 80/94. Access to the Interstate is via Grant Street. The location map contained in the addenda to this report provided a view of the surrounding roadways and proximity of the subject property.

Site Description

The subject property is irregular in shape containing 11.04 acres, including a permanent levee easement. The subject includes approximately 10 acres of tillable land. A legal description and plat of the site is included in the lease contained in the addenda to this report. The subject property is situated in a A4 Flood Zone and is designated as Zone M-1, Limited Manufacturing by the City of Gary, permitting commercial and light industrial uses.

The routine inspection of the subject and the nearby area disclosed no unusual adverse conditions affecting the land, but no responsibility is accepted for disclosing or evaluating subsoil, hidden or unusual conditions.

The appraiser is not an expert in determining the presence of hazardous substances, defined as all hazardous or toxic materials, waste, pollutants or contaminants, including but not limited to asbestos, PCB, UFFI, or other raw material or chemicals used in construction or otherwise present on the property. The appraiser assumes no responsibility for studies or analyses which would be required to conclude the presence or absence of such substances. The client is urged to obtain an update to this study, if desired. The personal surface site inspection by the appraiser and extensive discussion with the property owners did not indicate a contamination problem with this site. The
appraiser reserves the right to alter this valuation should a study discover an environmental problem.

**Improvement Description**

The subject property is currently put to use as a retail farm stand with warehouse. The subject property is currently improved with a retail/warehouse building that is actually two buildings connected with a through passage, and parking lot. The first building (produce) was reportedly constructed during 1975 and the second building (meat market) was reportedly constructed during 1989.

The first building contains approximately 6,033 square feet of area and the second building contains approximately 3,458 square feet of area. Both buildings are of pole frame construction with metal siding and roof and concrete slab floors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HIGHEST AND BEST USE:</strong></th>
<th>Highest and best use &quot;as though vacant&quot; - industrial development. (See definition for highest and best use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest and best use &quot;as improved&quot; – mixed use retail / warehouse facility. (current use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPERTY HISTORY:** The subject property is currently owned by Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission. There have been no transfers of the subject property within three years of the date of this appraisal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDICATED EXPOSURE TIME:</strong></th>
<th>12 to 24 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ESTIMATED MARKETING TIME:</strong></th>
<th>12 to 24 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**COST APPROACH:** The cost approach was not considered for this assignment. Buyers and sellers would not give the cost analysis much thought, so the cost approach was not done.

**SALES COMPARISON APPROACH:** The sales comparison approach, or market approach, is based upon a comparison of the prices that are paid for similar competitive properties in the same market, representing bonafide arm's length transactions. This approach works best in an active market where these prices serve as good indicators of the most probable selling price of the subject property as of the valuation date.

Comparable sales are analyzed and adjusted for conditions in the market, terms of financing, unusual conditions of sale, differences in physical characteristics and location. The adjusted sales price should be what the comparable property would have sold for if it had possessed identical characteristics of the subject property at the time of sale.

A review of the Gary and Northwest Indiana area revealed sales of industrial properties similar to the subject property. Sales of similar properties transpiring between December, 1998 and May, 2002 have indicated a fairly close range of about $15.50 to
$25.00 per square foot. Some of the sales were newer properties in better locations, while others were older properties of lesser quality and condition and provide a reasonable indication of what a potential investor might pay for an industrial property. Those sales given the greatest consideration are scheduled below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Sale Price Per SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/02</td>
<td>4931 Riverside Dr. Gary, Indiana</td>
<td>$262,900</td>
<td>16,949sf</td>
<td>$15.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/98</td>
<td>1358 Blaine Street Gary, Indiana</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>10,740sf</td>
<td>$16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/99</td>
<td>4928 Hohman Avenue Hammond, Indiana</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
<td>10,200sf</td>
<td>$19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/02</td>
<td>1103 138th Place East Chicago, Indiana</td>
<td>$162,500</td>
<td>9,600sf</td>
<td>$16.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/01</td>
<td>3715 Garfield Gary, Indiana</td>
<td>$ 95,000</td>
<td>3,800sf</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appraiser has concluded a value indication of $18.00 per square foot for the subject property.

9,489 square feet x $18.00 per square foot = $170,802.00

Say $170,000.00

INCOME APPROACH:

The value opinion using this approach is derived by estimating the market rent of the property (in other words, that income ascribable to a property improved to its highest and best use), deducting all pertinent expenses (experienced under competent management) and capitalizing the resulting net income with an appropriate capitalization rate to obtain the present value of the forecasted income stream. This method provides an objective estimate of what a prudent, informed investor would pay for the subject property.

The subject property is not owner occupied and is currently leased. Thus, there is a leased fee interest in the subject property as follows:

The current rent for the subject property is $20,400.00 per year or $2.15 per square foot of area. Vacancy and collection expense is estimated at 10%, resulting in an effective gross income of $18,360.00. After deducting management fees of 4% of effective gross income, reserves of $.15 per square foot of total building area and insurance expenses of $1,500.00, this results in a net operating income of $14,702.25. Capitalizing net operating income at a capitalization rate of 10.00% results in a value indication via the income capitalization approach of $147,022.50 or Say $145,000.00

Professional Appraisal Services, LLC
A review of the market and data contained in the appraiser’s file’s indicated similar property’s in the Northwest Indiana market area rent from $2.00 per square foot to $4.13 per square foot on an annualized basis. Market rent for the subject property is estimated at $2.50 per square foot of area resulting in a potential gross income of $23,722.50. Vacancy and collection expense is estimated at 10%, resulting in an effective gross income of $21,350.25. After deducting management fees of 4% of effective gross income, reserves of $.15 per square foot of total building area and insurance expenses of $1,500.00, this results in a net operating income of $17,572.89. Capitalizing net operating income at a capitalization rate of 10.00% results in a value indication via the income capitalization approach of $175,728.90 or Say $175,000.00.

RECONCILIATION & FINAL VALUE ESTIMATE: Based on the evidence available and the data that was developed extensively in the approaches to value, the indicated range of value is between $170,000.00 and $175,000.00. The Sales Comparison approach and Income Capitalization Approach were given consideration in the final value estimate with an emphasis on the Sales Comparison Approach, with adequate support from the Income Capitalization approach. Therefore, the final value estimate of the fee simple interest in the subject property as of August 21, 2002 is:

$170,000.00

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS

LEASE OR SALE:
The client has also inquired as to the economic benefit of selling the subject property outright as opposed to leasing the subject property. No criteria of evaluation have been specified to approach which option creates the maximum economic benefit.

Realtors are typically engaged to sell real estate in this market place with sales costs approximating 8.00% of the sales price. Thus, with a sales price of $170,000.00, the net sale proceeds would amount to $156,400.00 to the seller.

Using the net operating income of $17,572.89 derived from the estimated market rents provides a means to calculate an internal rate of return when dividing by the net sales proceeds of $156,400.00 to the seller. This approach is used due to the lack of specified criteria from the client. The rate of return equates to 11.23% on an annualized basis.

According to the Korpacz Real Estate Investor Survey non institutional grade properties realize internal rates of return in the range from 11.5% to 16.5%, averaging 12.95% for Flex / R&D industrial properties and 11.00% to 12.75%, averaging 11.88% for warehouse properties similar to the subject property. Since these returns represent expectations of national investors, the rate of return for the subject property would be at the highest end of these ranges and very probably above the stated ranges.

The subject property is not considered an investment grade property because the local market is dominated by owner occupants and it is situated in a slow growth neighborhood. Further, since the subject property has a calculated internal rate of return of 11.23% well below the rates of return typically sought, it would not be held for investment purposes and would be sold by the typical investor.
It should be noted that each investor has differing criteria for owning a property or not. An owner occupant owns for their specific use or other criteria, an investor owns to achieve a rate of return or reward. A government entity often owns real estate to serve a specific need of the public. In most cases, ownership is related to the need to meet the specific expertise and interest of the ownership entity.
NOTE: THIS SKETCH IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES AND IS NOT TO SCALE. THE INTENT IS TO SHOW APPROX. RELATIONSHIP OF ADJACENT PROPERTIES.

AREA 1 - 1.05 ac.†
AREA 2 - 2.40 ac.†
AREA 3 - 2.00 ac.†
TOTAL - 6.45 ac.†

CURRENT LEASE AGREEMENT FOR BERKHEIMERS (2.05 ACRES, MORE OR LESS)

JULY 24, 2002
SUBJECT: -0- 35th Avenue, Gary, Indiana

PURPOSE OF THE APPRAISAL: The purpose of the appraisal is to estimate the market value of the fee simple interest in the subject property as of August 21, 2002.

INTENDED USE OF REPORT: For the sole purpose of estimating the market value of the fee simple interest in the subject property as it relates to the possible listing or sale of the subject property by the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission.

INTEREST VALUED: Fee simple interest.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE: August 21, 2002.

DATE OF REPORT: September 5, 2002.

APPRAISAL DEVELOPMENT AND REPORTING PROCESS: In preparing this appraisal, we inspected the subject property on August 21, 2002. The subject neighborhood and similar neighborhoods in the Gary area and other competing areas of Lake County were considered in the collection of comparable sales and confirmed with representatives of the transactions. This information was applied in the Sales Comparison Approach to Value. Both the cost and income approaches were not considered to be applicable for this assignment.

This restricted use appraisal report sets forth only my conclusions. Supporting documentation is retained in the office file. This report is developed to be in conformance with the reporting requirements of Standards Rule 2-2(c) of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice for a restricted appraisal report.

The appraisers lack the knowledge and experience with respect to the detection and measurement of hazardous substances. Therefore, this assignment does not cover the presence or absence of such substances as discussed in the Standard Statement of Contingent and Limiting Conditions section of this report. However, any visual or obviously known hazardous substances affecting the property will be reported and an indication of its impact on value will be discussed.

REAL ESTATE APPRAISED: The subject of this appraisal is a 6.45 acre (+/-) portion of a larger parcel of land located on 35th Avenue in Gary, Indiana. A working sketch further identifying the subject property is contained in the Addenda to this report.

HIGHEST AND BEST USE: Highest and best use "as though vacant" – The flood plain designation, supply/demand relationship and physical characteristics of the site limit the subject sites maximally productive use to that of vacant land, green area, or storage uses.

(See definition for highest and best use)
Highest and best use “as improved” – use to that of vacant land, green area, or storage uses.

PROPERTY HISTORY: According to the public records the subject property has not transferred within three years of the date of this appraisal.

INDICATED EXPOSURE TIME: 24 to 36 months

ESTIMATED MARKETING TIME: 24 to 36 months

FINAL VALUE ESTIMATE: $16,000.00 (Sixteen Thousand Dollars).

INVESTMENT VALUE: Investment value is defined as “The specific value of an investment to a particular investor or class of investors based on individual investment requirements; distinguished from market value, which is impersonal and detached”.

A 2.05 acre portion of the subject property is currently leased to the adjoining property owner. The lease terms are month to month at the rate of $200.00 per month or $2,400.00 per year. The appraiser was unable to locate any rental data for small acreage parcel or large acreage parcels of land similar to the subject property. Based upon the Sales Comparison Approach to value the market value of the subject property concluded above is $16,000.00 or $2,500.00 per acre.

The annual rent for this parcel provides the owners with a generous return on the land value at $2,500.00 per acre. Given this income, the appraiser can estimate an investment value for the subject property.

According to the Korpacz Real Estate Investor Survey non institutional grade properties realize internal rates of return in the range from 11.5% to 16.5%, averaging 12.95% for Flex / R&D industrial properties and 11.00% to 12.75%, averaging 11.88% for warehouse properties similar to the subject property. Although the subject property has no improvements situated on it, a yield to the land can be estimated from these data as the land is leased for industrial uses. The yield to land is a less risky proposition than that involved with improved properties. Thus, yields to bare land are lower. Given the yields for improved properties are about 16% to 18% or higher, the yield to land without improvements might run yield 16%.

Based upon a 16% yield the land investment value would be $7,804.88 per acre for the 2.05 acres. Since the rental rate, for a larger and irregularly horseshoe shaped parcel with broken road frontage, would likely rent for significantly less than the rectangular shaped 2.05 acre parcel a lower annual rent is required to project the investment value for the subject property as a whole. The rent for the larger 6.45 acre parcel might approximate $6,200.00 a year or $980.00 per acre and derive an investment value of $36,700.00 to Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission.
The subject property is not considered an investment grade property because the local market is dominated by owner occupants and it is situated in a slow growth neighborhood. Although, the subject property currently has what might be considered a attractive internal rate of return, it would not be held for investment purposes and would be sold by the typical investor. This is primarily due to the limited marketability of the subject property.

Only the immediately adjoining property owner has an interest in the subject property. This interest is apparently for investment purposes only so that they can continue to do business from their current sight of operations within the City of Gary. Contractors who conduct work for the City need to be located in the City. Thus, the current tenant's interest is also an investment value. Considering the above investment valuation was based upon the current lease rents paid by the adjoining property owner, they provide a beginning point for negotiations for the possible sale or continued lease of the subject property to the adjoining property owner.

The existing tenant has other viable options as there is an abundance of vacant land in the City and certainly a viable office/warehouse market present in the City as well. It is not likely that the tenant would buy vacant land to build as there is very limited new industrial construction presently taking place in the City.

It should be noted that each investor has differing criteria for owning a property or not. An owner occupant owns for there specific use or other criteria, an investor owns to achieve a rate of return or reward. A government entity often owns real estate to serve a specific need of the public. In most cases, ownership is related to the need to meet the specific expertise and interest of the ownership entity.
TO: Imad Samara, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

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

SUBJECT: Friendly Reminder and Update

DATE: September 17, 2002

1. I talked to Herb Woldt from NIPSCO on 9/11 regarding electric power that will be required for the Stage III Remediation project. He needs the information to design and coordinate the location of the electric service and to do so, he needs to be provided the COE design showing the electric details, and site plan. From this, he will provide a cost estimate to run power for the pumps west of Grant Street and for the East Reach Remediation area.

   • Herb submitted information to Ernie Go approximately 6-8 months ago as to what he needed and was not provided with all the information he needed to complete his task. Will you see to it that Mr. Woldt gets this information in order that he may schedule this work to be done prior to construction.

   • Upon receipt of the design and cost estimate, you will need to complete your cost analysis and concurrence. These services will then be coordinated by NIPSCO with the city of Gary (owner) to pay for the costs under the NIPSCO 30-month payback program similar to what we did before with the (4) previous east reach pump stations.

   • Mr. Woldt also asked about the status of the pump station directly west of Grant Street that will be included as part of the project currently being done by the city of Gary. I told him that final design had not yet been completed and that we would send him the plans for final review and comment.

2. As we discussed at our meeting on 9/13, I would appreciate if you could send me several copies of the project map that would show only the west reach. We will be using this map for the submittal to IDNR as part of the permit application.

3. We had a final inspection for the installation of auxiliary power for the North Burr Street Pump Station on September 13, 2002. After the instructional was completed, I talked to Willie Wallace from the White River Environmental Partnership and will coordinate with him and the Griffith area office to request the addition of a few items to this system in order that this system may be used properly and effectively.
4. As we discussed in the field on 9/13, it is still critical that the COE will address remaining items that have been outstanding with the Gary Sanitary District in order that we may proceed with coordination for Gary to take responsibility for future O&M of not only the Burr Street Pump Station but the Ironwood Pump Station, Grant Street Pump Station, and the Broadway Pump Station.

- I am in the process of preparing a simple breakdown of all the east reach O&M by task and location for each stage/phase. I’m hoping to work with Gary to take over as many tasks (at their cost) as possible.
- You have been telling us that the COE is anxious to start turning over completed segments, and I know you are aware we have no money to do this. We need time to coordinate this properly with Gary and to do so, I would hope you will not delay this process any longer.

5. I have been in contact with the communities and utilities regarding utility relocations for the Stage VI-1 and VI-2 projects as well as Burr Street, Phase 2. I am compiling additional information in order that I may proceed as we have discussed with getting the necessary utility information, as well as compensability determination, in order that we can enter into the necessary agreements.

- I will notify all utilities and communities that the current COE schedule indicates that VI-1 and VI-2 will be advertised in October, 2003.

6. In reviewing the COE schedule we went over on 9/13, I noticed that the Stage III Remediation contract was anticipated to be at a cost of $2.4 million. I also noticed that there was $168,000 total in line items for non-federal participation. Could you please clarify for me why a non-federal cost share is required when the COE is remediating in an area where they had to correct a problem that they created during Stage III construction by cutting the field tiles in that area. I thought that the COE was going to do this on a separate contract at their own expense.

/sjm
cc: Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
September 26, 2002

Mr. Michael Griffin
Clerk-Treasurer
Town of Highland
3333 Ridge Road
Highland, Indiana 46322-2069

Dear Mike:

As per your request, enclosed please find three (3) copies of the fully executed and recorded copies of the 81st Street and the 5th Street Pump Stations agreement between the town of Highland and the Development Commission.

We appreciate your help and cooperation in executing this agreement. It is critical for the Development Commission to assure operation and maintenance of completed portions of our flood control/recreation project to the Army Corps of Engineers as part of our Local Cooperation Agreement. The State Budget Committee has questioned the Development Commission about what have the local communities benefiting from this project done to help—this is an excellent example of local participation.

We look forward to meeting with the town of Highland, and its' appropriate representatives to finalize the turnover process. We have manuals, "as-built" drawings, guarantees and warranties, as well as spare parts to turn over. We will be contacting the town in the near future to facilitate this meeting. If you have any questions, please call either myself or Jim Pokrajac at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

/encl.

cc: John Bach, Highland Public Works
Imad Samara, ACOE
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
TO: Lou Casale, Attorney-at-Law

FROM: Jim Pokrajac, Agent, Land Management/Engineering

SUBJECT: Southeast Hessville Pump Station agreement

DATE: September 9, 2002

Will you please begin the process of obtaining an inter-local agreement with the Hammond Sanitary District for the Southeast Hessville Pump Station. The Southeast Hessville Pump Station is located east of the Carlson OxBow Park south of I-80/94 at the very southern end of the city of Hammond. Construction has been completed and inspected and found to be satisfactory as per Army Corps of Engineers plans & specifications. We have been requested by the Corps office to coordinate assurance that the operation and maintenance of this pump station will be done. Similarly, as with the town of Highland (81st Street Pump Station) which you have previously executed, we would suggest following the same format in coordinating with the appropriate representatives for the Hammond Sanitary District.

Enclosed, as per your request, is a copy of the letter for the authorization for entry for construction for this project along with the pump station location drawing and the fully executed easement agreement between the Development Commission and the Hammond Sanitary District.

If you have any questions, please give me a call.

/sjm
encl
Mr. Kelly Hall  
C&H MOWING  
918 So. 250 W  
Hebron, Indiana 46341

Dear Kelly:

At our September 5th Commission meeting, a motion was made and approved authorizing you to do the second mowing of our levees this fall in the amount of $3500, as per your proposal. We have already signed an agreement and no additional paperwork is necessary. The scope of work will remain the same and we would appreciate your mowing these levees at your latest convenience this year. We may add some minor areas to be mowed and we will notify you at the time you contact us as to whether or not additions will be made.

Consider this letter as your authorization to do this work. Notify us a minimum of one week prior to your mowing in order that we may coordinate this with you.

If you have any questions regarding this work, please call me.

Sincerely,

James E. Pokrajac, Agent  
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
LAND ACQUISITION REPORT

For meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2002
(Information in this report is from August 28, 2002 – September 2, 2002)

STATUS (Stage III) – Chase to Grant:
1. Final acquisitions for flowage easements east of Chase and north of the river are on hold due to our funding crisis.

STATUS (Stage III) – REMEDIATION
Pumping west of Grant Street
1. Status of Right-of-Entry:
   • ROE was signed by the LCRBDC on April 4th, 2002.

STATUS (Stage IV – Phase 1 South) EJ&E RR to Burr St – South Levee:
1. WIND permanent easement needs to be signed.
   • We received a letter from the WIND attorney on September 11th, 2002, requesting proposed easement language for them to review.
   • An updated appraisal will be completed to make a new offer to WIND.

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 2) – Indianapolis to Kennedy – North Levee:
1. The tentative schedule for this project as of July, 2002 is for advertisement in December 2005, construction start in spring 2006, and completion in the fall of 2007.
2. Wicker Park appraisal is currently under COE review. Additional appraisal and a tree survey may be needed.

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 3) – Northcote to Indianapolis – (Woodmar Country Club):
1. Construction is currently projected to start in the summer of 2006 due to lack of State funds.

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 1) – Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to Liable – South of the River:
1. Appraisals for Highland town, park, and Public Works parcels were sent to reviewer on July 31st, 2002 and are being reviewed by the COE.
   • Corps reviewer has requested revisions on the appraisals. Appraiser will submit revisions ASAP.
2. We received an appraisal for the Burger King property west of Cline Avenue in the amount of $90,000. This was sent to the COE chief appraiser to review on August 7th.
   • We presented this preliminarily to the COE on July 26th for design re-considerations that could save considerable money on project costs. (Awaiting COE review)
3. Appraiser submitted Kennedy Industrial Park appraisal on September 20th, 2002. It was sent overnight to Corps reviewer on September 24th, 2002. Corps reviewer has agreed to review this appraisal as priority so we can get offers out ASAP. The appraisal covers 20 parcels.
4. We received a call from a landowner about taking down the fence around the swimming pool and leaving them in non-compliance with state rules. We are asking the Corps to modify the construction contract to require contractor to erect a "substantial" fence.
STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 2) – Liable to Cline – South of the river:
1. We had a meeting with the COE on July 17 to review coordination, design, and real estate for Stage VI-2. RANI ENGINEERING was on a conference call. In a phone conversation on August 27, 2002, COE indicated they are modifying their contract with RANI Engineering and will probably have drawings complete by mid-September. Stage VI-2 present deadline is October 1st, 2003. (ongoing as of September 27th, 2002.)
   • We anticipate real estate drawings from RANI (2) weeks after they receive final information from the COE regarding engineering issues.
   • Imad anticipated the COE will have this to RANI by mid-August. (ongoing)

STATUS (Stage VII) – Northcote to Columbia:
1. Acquisition in this area will be in sequence, working westward from Cline Avenue (by stage and phase) due to hydrology considerations.
2. COE Real Estate Dept. is proposing that we deviate from Federal policy and acquire bike trail easements on the levee instead of fee purchases. A sample easement was sent on 8/13. Attorney and COE are in discussion.

STATUS (Stage VIII – Columbia to State Line (Both Sides of River)
1. Mr. and Mrs. Gleason, landowners west of Hohman, are waiting for our response to a meeting with Jim Mandon in Munster about their street flooding in heavy rains. Meeting has yet to be scheduled.

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. Acquisition deadline is currently on hold.
2. Existing offers will be paid, however, no new offers will be sent. Burr Betterment levee is not creditable.
3. A letter was sent to the COE on September 25th, 2002, along with legal descriptions for the (2) NSRR easements requesting confirmation that these are current and have not been modified.
   • If they are current, we can proceed with preliminary work on all NSRR permanent easement wording without charging this betterment levee expense.

EAST REACH REMEDIATION AREA – (NORTH OF I-80/94, MLK TO I-65):
1. Clean-up acquisition continues for those offers already sent. No new offers will be sent due to funding problems.

IN-PROJECT MITIGATION:
1. Bids were opened on September 17th, 2002: Implementation and maintenance. Construction will probably start 2002 and continue in 2003. (Refer to Engineering Report for breakdown.)

HOBART MARSH MITIGATION:
1. Trust for Public Lands made presentation at Environmental meeting on August 30th, 2002. We will continue having Hobart Marsh lands appraised and order title work to get breakdown information in place so offers can be made by TPL ASAP. The project
manager Mike McCurdy will visit LCRBDC on September 27th, 2002, to discuss procedure.


3. FYI – The DNR has given us a list of 13 priority properties in Hobart Marsh. Full cost including professional services of title work and appraisals would total approx. $1,233,405.
September 11, 2002

Louis M. Casale, Esq.
Casale, Woodward & Buls, LLP
9223 Broadway – Suite A
Cambridge Commons
Merrillville, IN 46410

RE: Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation (WIND AM) Easement Issue
Our File No. 11896-1

Dear Mr. Casale:

As I told you by voice mail on August 26, 2002, your client, Jim Pokrajac of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (the "Commission") spoke with my client, Mr. Paul Easter of Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation, WIND AM, ("WIND") about the need to complete an easement for the WIND property now that the construction work is finished.

In the voice mail I left you, I indicated that we are certainly willing to work with you to finalize the easement, which you were discussing at one time with my colleague, Sarah Fanzini. Although Sarah is on leave from our firm at the present time, I spoke with her recently by phone. Sarah indicates that she attempted to contact you several times, as reflected in her files, but you did not respond to her regarding this issue so we believed it was resolved.

I am certain both our clients would appreciate having this matter completed. If you will forward proposed easement language that reflects the current site status, I will be happy to review it and respond to you as quickly as possible. My phone number is 317-684-5232, and our fax number is 317-684-5173. I look forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

BOSE McKinney & Evans LLP

[Signature]

Kathleen G. Lucas

cc: Dan Gardner
    Jim Pokrajac
    Paul Easter
September 25, 2002

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

Dear Imad:

Enclosed are the latest legal descriptions for the easements needed from the Norfolk Southern RR as part of the Burr Street Phase 2 project. These were done on June 22, 2001 based upon coordinate information we had at that time. As we discussed at our Real Estate meeting on September 20, I want to assure that these locations, coordinates, and legal descriptions are current and accurate. If they are, I would like to use these documents as part of our easement agreement and to proceed with your request for us to sign a right-of-entry. I am pursuing this at this time because our past experiences with the railroads indicate that it may take a lengthy period of time.

It is not our intent to spend any money with the Norfolk Southern, but I would like to have the agreements in place in order that when outside money would become available, we could proceed immediately. It is our understanding that money may be made available by the city of Gary from casino money and we should find out early in 2003 if this will be in their budget. It would help us to expedite this process by pursuing it at this point in time. If you have any questions, please call me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
end.
cc: Linda Sorn
    Chystal Spokane (w/encl)
    Khalid Masli (w/encl)
    Lou Casale
    Jim Flora
    Arlene Colvin
Judy Vamos

From: "Dorward, Gregory P LRP" <Gregory.P.Dorward@lrp02.usace.army.mil>
To: "Judy Vamos" <jvamos@nlrpc.org>
Cc: "Spokane, Chrystal L LRC" <Chrystal.L.Spokane@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2002 6:30 AM
Subject: RE: Outstanding Appraisals

Judy - thanks for the update -

as to your questions

1- let me look at Ms. O'Toole's work and then we can decide how to handle the reports

2- DC 497 - I have never seen that report

3- DC209 - was reviewed and rejected

4- DC1198 - Wicker Park - is in progress. Awaiting information from Chicago office to provide to atty. Additional tree survey may be required for the area west of Hart Ditch. May also require an additional appraisal project of the park itself.

greg

--------Original Message--------
From: Judy Vamos (mailto:jvamos@nlrpc.org)
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2002 7:30 PM
To: Dorward, Gregory P LRP
Subject: Outstanding Appraisals

<< Message: Untitled Attachment >> << File: Angie Ogrentz.vcf >>
24 September 2002

Mr. Gregory Dorword, Chief Appraiser
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  Pittsburgh District
1000 Liberty Avenue
1802 Moorhead Federal Building
Pittsburgh, PA  15222-4186

Dear Greg,

RE: Stage VI-1  The Kennedy Industrial Park Appraisal

Enclosed in this mailing is the Kennedy Industrial Park Appraisal completed by Dale Kleszynski, President of Associated Property Counselors. The appraisal covers 20 tracts with various DC numbers from 1010-A to 1022.

Would you please review the appraisal and let me know your decision?

I understand that you have been in contact with Dale during the progress of this work and will continue to discuss appraisal issues with him. I will also keep in touch with you and Dale as we proceed.

Please call me if you have questions. Thank you.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent

Enclosure:
23 September

Dear Imad,

I received a call today from a landowner on North Drive in Stage VI-1. Her concern is her fence across the back yard which would be taken down during construction time.

She has a swimming pool and removing her fence and not putting up a "substantial fence" would put her in violation of Highland's building code that requires, I think a 4 ft. fence, around the pool at all times. I'm waiting for a response from the Highland Town Hall about the height of safety fence around the pool.

Would you write me an e-mail or letter stating that your (Corps) contract would be modified to require the contractor to erect a substantial chain link fence to keep this landowner and perhaps others in compliance with the Town's building code?

I also left a message for Chrystal. Perhaps you and her could discuss this. Call me if questions. Thanks.

JV
Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project
Phone: 219-763-0696
Fax: 219-762-1763
e-mail: jvamos@nirpc.org

Bob Knight 02-25-02
Tell the landowner to meet with the engineer and the architect and get a building permit.
RCP 02-25-02
11 September 2002

Ms. Chris Slattery, Director
Trust for Public Land  Chicago Field Office
53 West Jackson Boulevard  Suite 1663
Chicago, IL  60604

Dear Ms. Slattery:

RE: Your presentation at the Environmental Committee Meeting of the
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC)

My thanks come to you and Mike McCurdy for staying after the Environmental
Committee Meeting on 30 August 2002 to discuss the mechanics of the Trust for
Public Land (TPL) land acquisition procedures. TPL's procedure differs from
the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project's, but I'm
confident we can work together toward the goals of preserving land in the
Hobart Marsh area and complying with the Mitigation Plan of the LCRBDC.

As we discussed I'll be in touch with Mr. McCurdy to set a date for his visit to
our office. He can review our files and the acquisition procedures approved by
the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Indiana Department
of Natural Resources (IN DNR).

I have already begun research at the Lake County Government Center in Crown
Point, Indiana on the IN DNR's list of suggested properties. Securing more
appraisers takes time and I am working on it. I've also called a local volunteer
who could provide me names of additional volunteers to work with TPL in the
field.

Please call me or LCRBDC Executive Director Dan Gardner at 219-763-0696 if
you have any questions about the project or land acquisition. I look forward to
working with you, Mike, and the Trust for Public Land.

Respectfully,

Judith (Judy) Vamos,
Land Acquisition
16 September 2002

Ms. Chris Slattery, Director
Trust for Public Land  Chicago Field Office
53 West Jackson Boulevard  Suite 1663
Chicago, IL  60604

Dear Ms. Slattery:

RE: Trust for Public Land Financial Statement

I send my appreciation today for your letter on 5 September 2002 for the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission monthly meeting. Your letter was informative and I think the commissioners have a better understanding of your commitment to cooperate with the flood project.

At our commissioner’s meeting a question was raised concerning the financial statements of not-for-profit organizations. To answer that question I am requesting a copy of your financial statement for the year 2001 as I stated in my phone message today. I will distribute it to the commissioners for the October meeting.

Thank you for your cooperation on this subject and I ask that you call me if your have questions.

Respectfully,

Judy Vamos

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition
24 September 2002

Mr. Gregory Dorword, Chief Appraiser
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  Pittsburgh District
1000 Liberty Avenue
1802 Moorhead Federal Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-4186

Dear Greg,

RE: Appraisals for LCRBDC Mitigation Tracts

Enclosed in this mailing are two (2) appraisals numbered DC M-1 (owner Kim) and M-3 (owner Fadell) for mitigation acquisitions in the Hobart Marsh Area. These appraisals were revised according to your recommendations by the appraiser Janet O'Toole of Janet O'Toole and Associates.

Would you please review these revised appraisals on a first priority basis since mitigation is a first priority for the LCRBDC?

Thank you for your cooperation and I ask that you call me if you have questions.

Respectfully,

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION, ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Den Ewoldt</td>
<td>LEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Flora</td>
<td>R.W. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy O'Brien</td>
<td>Holst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Gaweda</td>
<td>Metro water Rec. Dist. Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Sanchez</td>
<td>ACOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Melton</td>
<td>KRBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Casey</td>
<td>IHWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fahey</td>
<td>IWVSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table continues with empty rows 10 to 25.
PROJECT ENGINEERING
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, October 3, 2002

(Information in this report is from August 28, 2002 – September 26, 2002)

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 on December 1st, 1993
   Dyer/Ellas Construction – Contract price: $1,220,386

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3A) Georgia to Martin Luther King – South Levee:
1. Project completed on January 13th, 1995
   Ramirez & Marsch Construction – Contract price: $2,275,023

Landscaping Contract – Phase I (This contract includes all completed levee segments 0
installing, planting zones, seeding, and landscaping):
1. Project completed June 11, 1999
   Dyer Construction – Final contract cost: $1,292,066

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3B) Harrison to Georgia – South Levee:
1. Rausch Construction started on November 20th, 1995. (Construction is now completed)
   • Current contract amount - $3,477,249.66
   • Original contract amount - $3,293,968.00
   • Amount overrun - $183,281.66 (5.6%)
2. A final inspection with the LCRBDC and the COE will be scheduled for this entire portion of
   the project no later than October of 2002.

STATUS (Stage II Phase 3C2) Grant to Harrison: (8A contract)
1. WEBB Construction was the contractor.
   • Currently, $3,915,178.36 has been spent on this project.
   • Overrun (over original bid) $463,196

STATUS (Stage II Phase 4) Broadway to MLK Drive – North Levee:
1. Project is completed.
   • Current contract amount - $4,186,070.75
   • Original contract amount - $3,089,692.00
   • Amount overrun - $1,096,378 (36%)
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 October of 2002.
   • Final quantities for fill are currently being tabulated so costs can be determined.

**STATUS (Stage III) Chase to Grant Street:**
1. Project completed on May 6th, 1994
   Kiewit Construction – Contract price: $6,564,520

**STAGE II Drainage Remediation Plan:**
1. COE estimates approx. $1 million to do this work. $800,000 for ditches and pumps, $50,000 to engineer an 18,500 GPM pump station West of Grant St. 7 remainder toward work with the City of Gary.
2. The scope of this project is to include the following:
   A. Lift stations West of Grant to remediate drainage problems due to Stage III construction.
   B. East Reach remediation life station for interior drainage.
   C. Extending the combination sewer, East of Grant St., North to our line of protection.
3. Bids were opened on September 10th, 2002, and it appears **Dyer Construction** is the successful bidder.
   • The government estimate is $1,695,822 and the low bid came in at $1,231,845 (this is $463,977 under estimate).
   • The bid is currently being reviewed and the COE anticipates award by September 30th, 2002 and a construction start in the spring of 2003.
4. A memo was sent to the COE on September 17th, 2002, asking them to provide pertinent information to NIPSCO in order that they may engineer the electrical services. (see item #1)
   • LCRBDC also requested information from the COE on what our local share of $168,000 would be for this project is primarily to remediate drainage problems caused by the COE when they cut the field drain tiles during Stage III construction. (see item #6)

**STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 – North) Cline to Burr (North of the Norfolk Southern RR):**
1. IV-1 (North) The drainage system from Colfax to Burr St. North of the Norfolk Southern RR.
   • Current contract amount - $2,956,964.61
   • Original contract amount - $2,708,720.00
   • Amount overrun - $248,244.60 (9%)
2. We received “as built” drawings from the COE on March 13th, 2002. The only item needed to be completed is to assure turf growth in all areas.

**STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 – South) South of the Norfolk Southern RR):**
1. Dyer Construction was low bidder. Given 450 days to complete
   • Current contract amount - $4,285,345
   • Original contract amount – 3,862,737
   • Amount overrun - $422,608 (11%)
2. Overall construction is now complete. The COE did a preliminary walk—thru with the contractor on October 17th, 2001, and comprised a preliminary punch list.
   - An inspection is anticipated for October, 2002
3. WIND Radio facilities:
   - The COE anticipates repairing levee damage no later than the end of October, 2002.
4. A modification to add to the contract was completed by the COE on September 5th, 2002, in the amount of $18,850.
   - This included miscellaneous clean-up work, turf repair at WIND, and guardrails and fencing.

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 2A) Burr to Clark – Lake Etta:
1. Dyer Construction – 95% complete.
   - Current contract amount - $3,329,463.66
   - Original contract amount - $2,473,311.50
   - Amount overrun - $856,152 (34%)
2. The North Burr St. stormwater pumping station has been completed.
   A. The complete auxiliary power hook-up was completed by Austgen Electric and the inspection was held with the COE and GSD on September 13th, 2002.
      - The COE gave the LCRBDC (4) sets of O&M manuals for this station at this instructional meeting. This relieves the contractor from the remaining contractual obligations.
      - A letter was sent to the COE on September 17th, 2002, regarding some additional work that may need to be done at the request of the White River Environmental Partnership.
   B. A memo was sent to the COE on September 17th, 2002, requesting their consideration to add some minor items to the contract. (see item #3)

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 2B) Clark to Chase:
1. Project money status:
   - Current contract amount - $1,948,053.31
   - Original contract amount - $1,530,357.50
   - Amount overrun - $417,696 (27%)
2. COE is currently preparing for contract closeout. This will include submitting “as-built” drawings to the LCRBDC. (ongoing)

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) EJ & E RR 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 5th, 2000
   - The low bidder is Dyer Construction.
   - Current contract amount - $2,228,652.16
   - Original contract amount - $2,074,072.70
   - Amount overrun - $113,604.62 (6%)
2. The drainage ditch north of the Mansards is having sloughing problems that should be corrected when Burr St. Phase II is completed.
STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr St., the 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. The projected government estimate for this project is approx. $3.6 million.
   - A meeting was held with Mayor King on July 19th, 2002, to review current construction
     status of our overall project in Gary, present the LCRBDC dilemma with crediting and
     funding, and discuss if Gary could help us in any way.
   - Gary indicated that they would make every effort to include money for the betterment
     levee in their budget for 2003.

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

STATUS (Stage V Phase 2):
1. This project will be on hold for future utility coordination as well as land acquisition until
   money is available.
   - Tentative schedule for this project as of July, 2002, is for advertisement in December,
2. INDOT drainage issues at Indianapolis Boulevard and the Little Calumet River.
   A. An on site meeting with the COE, LCRBDC, INDOT, Highland, and North
      Township is scheduled for October 7th, 2002 to review their drainage proposal.
   B. We received a set of partial plans for this project from INDOT on August 14th, 2002.
      - They have not finalized the storm sewer and lift station design, but will forward them
        to us when completed. They anticipate this will be early October.
   C. INDOT anticipates that this project will have a March, 2003 letting, and a construction
      completion near the end of 2004.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 3) Woodmar Country Club:
1. Refer to Land Acquisition report for status of appraisal process and revised schedule.
   - The current schedule shows a March 2006 advertising date. This date is due to funding
     restrictions. The construction sequence due to hydrology will push construction back in
     the schedule.
2. This project will be done after all other construction between Cline Ave. and Northcote is
   completed due to hydrology concerns with installing the control structure as part of the
   project.

STATUS (Stage VI – Phase 1) Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to
Liable, South of the river:
1. The COE is currently planning to advertise this project in October, 2003, award in February
   of 2004, and start construction in April, 2004. This will be advertised at the same time as
   Stage VI-2. The contract estimate for Stage VI-1 is $6 million, Stage VI-2 is $3,650,000,
   and with the addition of the Grace Street pump station at $1.5 million, these total
   contracts are estimated at a cost of $11,150,000 (local share at 7% would be $780,500.)
2. A letter was sent to the COE on November 15th, 2001, requesting a list of all utilities, locations, costs, etc. in order that we may proceed with utility re-location agreements in a timely manner. (Refer to the COE/LCRBDC Coordination Report.)
   - The LCRBDC agreed to coordinate the utility re-locations in this area and sent a letter to the Town of Highland on September 23rd, 2002, to get costs, proof of property ownership for compensability, and updated engineering.
   - A letter was sent to NIPSCO for the same information above on September 24th, 2002.

**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. It is the intent of the COE to advertise this segment simultaneously and separately from Stage VI-1. The anticipated schedule is to advertise in October, 2003, award in February, 2004, and start construction in April of 2004.
3. A conference call was held with the COE, LCRBDC, and RANI ENGINEERING on July 17th, 2002, to review final engineering decisions, real estate, utilities, and recreation for VI-2.
   - RANI said they could complete real estate (2) weeks after they receive final information from the COE. COE anticipates final drawings for review approximately mid-September (after modification of contract between COE & RANI). Rani is still waiting as of September 27th, 2002.

**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. We sent a letter to the COE on February 1st, with comments to their 75% submittal indicating a number of concerns and requesting another review opportunity prior to the 100% review. (ongoing)
   - The COE anticipates we should be getting the 100% drawings for review and comment no later than the end of September, 2002. (ongoing)

**STATUS (Stage VIII) Columbia to the Illinois State Line):**
1. The A/E award was given to SEH (Short, Elliot & Henderson, Inc.)
   - This project is currently on hold due to funding constraints.
2. The COE anticipates Stage VIII engineering to resume in September 2002. A meeting will be scheduled for coordination at that point in time. (ongoing)

**East Reach Remediation Area – North of I-80/94, MLK to I-65**
1. Project cost information
   - Current contract amount - $1,873,784.68
   - Original contract amount - $1,657,913.00
   - Amount overrun - $215,971 (13%)

2. The lift station at the Southwest corner of the existing levee that will handle interior drainage will be done as part of the Stage III remediation project. (see Stage III remediation in this report for details.)
Mitigation (Construction Portion) for “In Project” Lands:
1. Bids were opened on September 17th, 2002, and it appears Renewable Resources, Inc. (from Barnesville, Georgia) is the successful bidder.
   - The government estimate is $1,017,082 and the low bid came in at $921,103 (this is $95,979 under the estimate).
   - The bid is currently being reviewed and the COE anticipates award by September 30th, 2002, and a construction start in the Spring of 2003.
2. We received a letter from the COE on May 14th, 2002, requesting that we make our 198 acres between Chase and Grant available for hydric soil to meet IDEM requirements.
3. We sent an email to the COE on August 6th, 2002, requesting confirmation as to what utility re-locations need to be done in order that we may begin the agreement process.
   - The COE anticipates no physical re-locations will be needed, but field representatives need to be present during work in or around any of their pipelines.

Landscaping – Phase II (East Reach):
1. This landscaping contract will include all completed East Reach construction – engineering is ongoing.

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.
   - A modification to add to this contract was done by the COE in the amount of $67,653.
   - This is for miscellaneous electrical changes or additions, clean-up, trash rack, and modifications to the discharge box.
   - A modification to the contract for continuous funding was done by the COE on August 5th, 2002, increasing money available for payment by $600,000 – new total available is $2,769,859.
2. Low bidder was Overstreet Construction. Notice to proceed was given on November 7th, 2000 – 700 work days to complete (Oct. 2002)
   - Current contract amount - $4,810,825
   - Original contract amount - $638,400.00
   - Amount overrun - $172,425 (3.7%)

Baring Pump Station
- 30% complete
- 2 pumps and motors are on site and being stored.
- Flap valves have been installed.
- Discharge box modification work is continuing.

Walnut Pump Station
- 55% complete
- 3 pumps have been rebuilt and are ready for testing. (These need new impellers.)
Contractor currently waiting for delivery of new impellers.
• Electric installation ongoing.
• Mechanical trash rack has been removed and the new rack is stored on site.

**S. Kennedy Pump Station**

• 45% complete
• One pump has been rebuilt and is being factory tested.
• Concrete discharge box modifications ongoing.
• New flap gates have been installed and part of the 8” discharge pipe has been removed.
• Mechanical trash rack removed. Pad for new rack has been modified and installed.

*(Testing and training will take place once electric is installed.)*

**Hohman/Munster Pump Station**

• 70% complete
• Electric installation 90% complete
• **Ventilation ductwork is being removed and new ductwork is being installed.**
• 2 additional pumps received have been installed (can be used as standbys)
• All new pumps and motors have been received and are in storage

4. We received the last status report from the COE on **September 20th, 2002**

**West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1B:**

1. The two (2) pump stations included in this contract are S.E. Hessville (Hammond), and 81st St. (Highland). Overall contract work is completed.
   A. A final inspection was held for both stations on September 18th, 2001. We received a letter that day listing key turnover items.
2. Thieneman Construction from Griffith, IN was the successful bidder.
   • Current contract amount - $2,120,730.12
   • Original contract amount - $1,963,400.00
   • Amount overrun - $157,330 (9%)
3. We received the last status report from the COE on **September 20th, 2002**.

**North Fifth Avenue Pump Station:**

1. The low bidder was Overstreet Construction
   • Current contract amount - $2,417,023.93
   • Original contract amount - $2,387,500.00
   • Amount overrun - **$29,523.93 (12%)**
   • Project is currently 55% completed
   • Project completion date is March 17th, 2003.
2. There are currently 10 pumps and all of these will be replaced with new and will be coordinated with the Town of Highland.
   • All pumps and motors have been delivered and are currently being stored on the job site.
3. We received the last status report from the COE on **September 20th, 2002**.
4. (4) pumps and motors have been removed.
   • Flap gates have been installed.
5. Exterior concrete work is almost complete, and the concrete for the South wet well and new trash rack are currently being installed.
6. We received a memo from the COE on September 20th, 2002, apologizing for Overstreet’s lack of overall production and timelines of repairing of construction

27
deficiencies. They also assured all efforts will be made by Overstreet to correct these problems.

General:
1. FEMA Remapping of Flood Plain
   A. A coordination meeting was held at the Lake County Surveyor’s office on August 23rd, 2002, to review and discuss the upcoming re-mapping of the flood plains in Northwest Indiana.
      • The purpose of the meeting was to answer questions and address local concerns.
      • This is the first step of informational gathering to re-doing the mapping.
      • It appears it will take one year to develop data and do an engineering study, and one year to develop quality control and mapping.

2. Utility re-locations
   • A memo was sent to the COE on September 17th, 2002, updating them on the status of re-locations for VI-1, VI-2, and Burr ST. II. (see item #5)
We opened bids for this project this afternoon the apparent low bid is
Dyer Construction  $1,231,845.00

This bid came under the Government estimate of $1,695,822.

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606
312-353-6400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256
FYI

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606
312-353-6400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256

-----Original Message-----
From: Blair, Regina C LRC
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2002 11:53 AM
To: Roncoll, Mark A COL LRC; Grady, Norman M LTC LRC; Marella, Guy J LRC; Deda, Roy J LRC; Samara, Imad LRC; Albert, Dick LRC; Deja, Tom LRC; Abeyta, Priscilla LRC; DLL-LRC-ALL-CT
Subject: Bid Results for DACW23-02-B-0003 Local Flood Protection, Lil Cal, IN
Importance: High

The Chicago District’s first Bid Opening was very successful. We received a total of five bids, all were walk-in. The bid opening results are summarized below.

BID OPENING RESULTS

September 10, 2002

LOCAL FLOOD PROTECTION, STAGE III
DRAINAGE REMEDIATION, LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, NW INDIANA

SOLICITATION NUMBER: DACW23-02-B-0003

Bid Opening Officer: Regina Blair
Bid Opener & Reader: Regina Blair
Recorder: Linda Zamaroczy

APPARENT LOW BIDDER: Dyer Construction Company, Inc.

1716 Sheffield Avenue
Dyer, IN 46311
Total Bid Amount: $1,231,845.00
2nd Low Bidder:  Kovilic Construction Company, Inc.
3721 Carnation Street
Franklin Park, IL 60131
Total Bid Amount:  $1,311,555.00

3rd Low Bidder:  Vistas Construction of Illinois, Inc.
7400 South Stony Island Avenue
Chicago, IL 60649
Total Bid Amount:  $1,417,679.40

Government Estimate Without Profit:  $1,695,822.00

Carpe Diem!

Regina G. Blair
Contracting Officer
Department of the Army
Chicago District, Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206
Telephone: (312) 353-6400 Ext. 1702
Email Address: Regina.G.Blair@lrc02.usace.army.mil

FRED  
Supervisor  $2,532,000

counsel  $1,705,350

9/11/2002
TO: Imad Samara, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

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

SUBJECT: Friendly Reminder and Update

DATE: September 17, 2002

1. I talked to Herb Woldt from NIPSCO on 9/11 regarding electric power that will be required for the Stage III Remediation project. He needs the information to design and coordinate the location of the electric service and to do so, he needs to be provided the COE design showing the electric details, and site plan. From this, he will provide a cost estimate to run power for the pumps west of Grant Street and for the East Reach Remediation area.

- Herb submitted information to Ernie Go approximately 6-8 months ago as to what he needed and was not provided with all the information he needed to complete his task. Will you see to it that Mr. Woldt gets this information in order that he may schedule this work to be done prior to construction.

- Upon receipt of the design and cost estimate, you will need to complete your cost analysis and concurrence. These services will then be coordinated by NIPSCO with the city of Gary (owner) to pay for the costs under the NIPSCO 30-month payback program similar to what we did before with the (4) previous east reach pump stations.

- Mr. Woldt also asked about the status of the pump station directly west of Grant Street that will be included as part of the project currently being done by the city of Gary. I told him that final design had not yet been completed and that we would send him the plans for final review and comment.

2. As we discussed at our meeting on 9/13, I would appreciate if you could send me several copies of the project map that would show only the west reach. We will be using this map for the submittal to IDNR as part of the permit application.

3. We had a final inspection for the installation of auxiliary power for the North Burr Street Pump Station on September 13, 2002. After the instructional was completed, I talked to Willie Wallace from the White River Environmental Partnership and will coordinate with him and the Griffith area office to request the addition of a few items to this system in order that this system may be used properly and effectively.
4. As we discussed in the field on 9/13, it is still critical that the COE will address remaining items that have been outstanding with the Gary Sanitary District in order that we may proceed with coordination for Gary to take responsibility for future O&M of not only the Burr Street Pump Station but the Ironwood Pump Station, Grant Street Pump Station, and the Broadway Pump Station.

- I am in the process of preparing a simple breakdown of all the east reach O&M by task and location for each stage/phase. I'm hoping to work with Gary to take over as many tasks (at their cost) as possible.
- You have been telling us that the COE is anxious to start turning over completed segments, and I know you are aware we have no money to do this. We need time to coordinate this properly with Gary and to do so, I would hope you will not delay this process any longer.

5. I have been in contact with the communities and utilities regarding utility relocations for the Stage VI-1 and VI-2 projects as well as Burr Street, Phase 2. I am compiling additional information in order that I may proceed as we have discussed with getting the necessary utility information, as well as compensability determination, in order that we can enter into the necessary agreements.

- I will notify all utilities and communities that the current COE schedule indicates that VI-1 and VI-2 will be advertised in October, 2003.

6. In reviewing the COE schedule we went over on 9/13, I noticed that the Stage III Remediation contract was anticipated to be at a cost of $2.4 million. I also noticed that there was $168,000 total in line items for non-federal participation. Could you please clarify for me why a non-federal cost share is required when the COE is remediating in an area where they had to correct a problem that they created during Stage III construction by cutting the field tiles in that area. I thought that the COE was going to do this on a separate contract at their own expense.

/gjm

cc: Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
MEMORANDUM FOR SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-00-C-0015
Local Flood Protection
Stage IV; Phase I-South
Little Calumet River, Indiana
Modification No. A00001 - Executed

1. Enclosed for your file is a copy of all pertinent information related to executed Modification No. A00001, under the subject contract.

2. Any questions concerning the enclosed items shall be directed to Douglas Anderson at (219) 923-1763/4.

Thomas A. Deja, P.E.
Area Engineer
Calumet Area Office

Enclosures

DISTRIBUTION:

CELRC-CO-C (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CO-S (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CT (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-PM-M (Mod. Only) I. Samara
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) E. Karwatka
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) D. Anderson
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) B. Waldrom
LCRBDC (Mod. Only) J. Pokrajac
SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE

2. MODIFICATION NO. (FC-15,21,22,23,24,25)

3. EFFECTIVE DATE

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.

5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)

6. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, CHICAGO
RIVER CENTER BUILDING
111 NORTH CANAL STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606-7206

Dyer Construction Company, Inc.
1716 Sheffield Avenue
Dyer, IN 46311

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)

9. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. ("")

10. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DACW27-90-C-0015

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

4 APRIL 2000

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning copies of the amendment;
(b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or
(c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter. Each telegram or letter must reference the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

☐ A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

☐ B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office).

X C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: CONTRACT CLAUSE 75, CHANGES.

☐ D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

BLOCK 14. CONTINUED ON THE ATTACHED SHEET
(Clean the NS Ditch, Repair the Levee Turf at WIND, Install Rip Rap at Calhoun St, Install A-Frame Gate, Install Guardrail at 29th & Stevenson)

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

Janet Furman
President

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFERER

By: Dyer Furman

15C. DATE SIGNED

9/5/02

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

Thomas A. Deja P.E.
Administrative Contracting Officer

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

16C. DATE SIGNED

05 SEP 2002

PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)

Proscribed by GSA

FAR (48 CFR) 53.243
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Modification No.: A00001 (FC-15.21-25)
Field Change Description: Clean the NS Ditch, Repair the Levee Turf at WIND, Install Rip Rap at Calhoun Street, Install A-Frame Gate, Install Guardrail at 29th & Stevenson
Contract No.: DACW27-00-C-0015
Contractor: Dyer Construction Company, Inc.

SF30, Block 14. Continued
regrading, plant, labor, materials, and incidentals necessary for repairing the damaged areas caused by WIND ground wire installation, including filling the grooves with topsoil, seeding the damaged areas, and re-seeding as needed to establish turf.

e. Reference Technical Provision 02110, CLEARING AND GRUBBING. Add Section 1.6.7 Removing Vegetation and Sediment from the NS Ditch. Payment for cleaning the NS Ditch between Calhoun Street and 29th Avenue, including removal of all soil, sediment, debris, and vegetative matter from the concrete liner in the bottom of the ditch, will be made at the contract lump sum for Bid Schedule Item 0042. Payment shall constitute full compensation for all excavation, plant, labor, materials, and incidentals necessary to clean the ditch liner and, if Contractor damages the banks of the ditch in the process of the work, repair the damage to the satisfaction of the Contracting Officer.

(3) CHANGES TO THE DRAWINGS:

(a) None

F. It is understood and agreed that the work will be completed by 31 OCTOBER 2002, and the total estimated amount of the contract is INCREASED by $18,850.35, from $4,266,494.35 as established by Modification P00018, to $4,285,344.70.

G. It is further understood and agreed that this modification constitutes compensation in full on behalf of the Contractor, and its subcontractors and suppliers for all cost and markups directly or indirectly attributable to the changes ordered.
Construction-Operations Division  
Calumet Area Office

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW23-95-C-0073  
Stage IV - Phase 2A; Levee Construction  
Little Calumet River, Indiana  
Transfer of Operations and Maintenance Manuals

Mr. Jim Pokrajac  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Road  
Portage, Indiana 46368

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

Enclosed are four (4) copies of Operations and Maintenance Manual for the external power receptacle, installed by modification under the subject contract.

This document is provided in accordance with the contract. The Contractor has met all contractual requirements for this contract. Mr. Imad Samara will be coordinating with you on transfer of the completed project for your operation and maintenance.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (219) 923-1763/4.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas A. Deja, P.E.  
Area Engineer  
Calumet Area Office

Enclosure
N. River St. Pump Station - Auxiliary Power

Name: Jim Porras
Company: Lyondell
Project: Dyer Coast Co.

Date: 9-21-94, 12-11-95

Ref. #3: 219-763-0946

El Keramatth 219-923-1763

Dave Nielsen 219-763-703

Y.V. Carrera 219-865-2981

R.W. Armstrong 219-765-2256

1. Pump Room: No air when pump power is hooked up.
   - New pump cannot phase.
   - New equipment installed.
   - Station would have been placed in service.

2. Blff. of station & bring-up group of old transformer:
   - Required. Old station & bringing-up group of old transformer in.
   - Old power source is manual, generator
   - All equipment must be checked.

* Note: Old pumps must be checked.

G.S. Smith, P.E., P.M. Andrew D. G. Under M.T.

Spike celler must be cleaned and last note.
September 17, 2002

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

Re: North Burr Street Pump Station Auxiliary Power Instructional

Dear Imad:

We had our instructional for the auxiliary power at the North Burr Street Pump Station on September 18, 2002. I enclosed a copy of the sign-in sheet, whereby the only person representing the city of Gary was Mr. Willie Wallace from White River Environmental Partnership. Several issues were brought up at this instructional, including concern by Mr. Wallace, as well as Austgen Electric, regarding the electrical phasing and its relevance to its connection for the generator for emergency power. I have also enclosed a copy of a fax transmittal from Mr. Wallace regarding this issue.

As we discussed in our field meeting, I mentioned to Ed Karwatka that I would provide him with this information in order that we may investigate the possibility of issuing a modification to the contract to include miscellaneous items necessary to make this auxiliary power hook-up effective and usable.

I was presented with 8 copies of the "Operation & Maintenance Manual for Burr Street Pump Station Power Service, Transfer of Power & Mobile Generator Connection Equipment". Prior to my distributing these operation & maintenance manuals, we need to complete our technical coordination with the Gary Sanitary District. There are still outstanding technical issues that need to be resolved and the COE is currently working to address these concerns. We cannot proceed with any turnover until these issues have been mutually agreed upon by all parties. I will notify you accordingly in order that we may turn these over to the responsible party and have an appropriate sign-off and turnover of all materials, 'as-builts', guarantees, warranties, and spare parts previously provided for the North Burr Street Pump Station.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.
cc: Tom Deja, COE
     Ed Karwatka, COE
     Willie Wallace, WREP
     Jim Flora, R. W. Armstrong Co.
From: "Wallace, Willie" <Willie.Wallace@UnitedWater.com>
To: <jkrajac@nirpc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2002 1:32 PM
Subject: Storm Station @ 32nd & Burr Street

Reference emergency generator:
I would request a phase monitor be placed at the connection point for emergency power.
Why?
Since the motors are submersed, one would not have indication of proper rotation.
Proper rotation is needed for flow and prevention of the holding nut from coming off the shaft.

Thanks, for allowing my input.

Willie.
After considering all the responses, the meeting is set for Monday, October 7th at 9:30 am (local time) at the site. Although not everyone will be able to attend, we are in a tight timetable for design of the lift station (Spring 2003 letting) and these issues need to be resolved a.s.a.p.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please feel free to contact our office.

Allen R. Egilmez, P.E.
Transportation Department Manager
United Consulting Engineers, Inc.
1625 North Post Road
Indianapolis, IN 46219-1995
Ph: (317) 895-2585
Fax: (317) 895-2596

-----Original Message-----
From: Allen Egilmez [mailto:allene@ucea.com]
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2002 4:15 PM
To: 'Imad.Samara@rc02.usace.army.mil'; 'pokrajac@nirpc.org'
Cc: 'JWRIGHT@indot.state.in.us'; 'HPATEL@jsengr.com'; Richter, Dave; Burch, Todd; 'MDOUGHERTY@indot.state.in.us'; 'CSCOTT@indot.state.in.us'; Bryant, Keith
Subject: US 41 Lift Station, Lake County

Gentlemen,

We have been hired by the Indiana Department of Transportation to design a storm sewer lift station on the southeast corner of US 41 (Calumet Avenue) and Little Calumet River in the Town of Highland, Indiana. The purpose of the lift station will be to discharge surface runoff from the proposed US 41 improvement project into the Little Calumet River. The project is set to be let for construction by the Indiana Department of Transportation in the Spring of 2003.

Prior to starting the design of the lift station, we would like to set up a
meeting to discuss of few issues related to the location of the lift station. We are offering the following dates for the meeting:

Wednesday, October 2  
Thursday, October 3  
Monday, October 7  
Tuesday, October 8  
Thursday, October 10  

If you could notify our office of your available dates, we will set up the meeting place and time.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact our office.

Allen R. Egilmez, P.E. 
Transportation Department Manager  
United Consulting Engineers, Inc.  
1625 North Post Road  
Indianapolis, IN 46219-1995  
Ph: (317) 895-2585  
Fax: (317) 895-2596
Mr. John Bach  
Director, Public Works Dept.  
Town of Highland  
3333 Ridge Road  
Highland, Indiana 46322

Dear John:

As per our conversation on September 16, I am sending this letter to follow up on our discussion regarding utility relocations in the upcoming segments between Kennedy Avenue and Cline Avenue.

I realize that, in the past, this was coordinated with Mr. Jan Plachta from the Army Corps office, but now I would like to follow up and gather all current information to assure that we have all we need to proceed with our process to enter into utility relocation agreements with the town of Highland. You have already provided some of this information to the Corps office and I have “bits and pieces” of this material. Will you please send all of the pertinent information you have directly to me in order that I may begin this process in a timely manner. The current Corps schedule is to advertise this project in October of 2003 with the actual construction starting in the spring of 2004.

The Army Corps has previously submitted to you their most recent drawings for Stage VI Phase 1, which includes all of our levee construction along the south side of the river from Liable Road westward to Kennedy Avenue. We have not received final drawings for the Stage VI Phase 2 project which will go south along Liable Road from the Little Calumet River to the NIPSCO right-of-way, thence east along the north side of the right-of-way to Cline Avenue. When I receive these final drawings, I will forward a set to you in order that we may coordinate this segment in the same manner.

In addition to the utility information you have already provided, will you also assure that we get individual cost estimates for each of these items, as well as proof of ownership of the lands where these utilities are located. Upon receipt of this information, the Development Commission will make a determination of compensability that is required by Federal regulations. We also must forward your cost estimates to the Corps in order that they may
review them to assure that they are current and fair. After these determinations have been made, we will contact you again so that we may enter into the necessary agreements to relocate these utilities.

If you have any questions regarding this request, please feel free to call me any time. Being that this is a request for a large amount of information, I would also be available for a meeting at your convenience.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm

cc: Imad Samara, ACOE  
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney  
Jim Flora, R.W.Armstrong Co.
FYI

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL  60606
312-353-6400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256

-----Original Message-----

From: Samara, Imad LRC
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2002 3:17 PM
To: Samara, Imad LRC
Subject: In Project Wetland Mitigation Contract

Today the Chicago District opened bids for the Little Calumet River Wetland Mitigation Contract, the apparent low bidder is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliable Resources</th>
<th>$921,102.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Estimate</td>
<td>$1,017,082.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL  60606
312-353-6400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256
Hi All,

Full and open competition is a wonderful thing. Our last bid opening for this fiscal year was very successful. We received a total of four bid packages. The results of the bid opening are summarized below.

**BID RESULTS:**

**SOLICITATION NUMBER:** DACW23-02-B-0002 (Wetland Mitigation, Lil Cal)

- **Bid Opening Officer:** Regina Blair
- **Bid Opener & Reader:** Regina Blair
- **Recorder:** Linda Zamarocy

**APPARENT LOW BIDDER** Renewable Resources, Inc.
265 Dean Road
Barnesville, GA 30204

**Total Bid Amount:** $921,102.68

**2nd Low Bidder:** George J. Beemsterboer, Inc.
16807 South Park Avenue  
South Holland, IL 60473  

Total Bid Amount: $1,402,078.00

3rd Low Bidder: Dyer Construction Company, Inc.  
1716 Sheffield Avenue  
Dyer, IN 46311  

Total Bid Amount: $1,702,441.00

4th Low Bidder: Vistas Construction of Illinois, Inc.  
7400 South Stony Island Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60649  

Total Bid Amount: $2,271,636.46

Government Estimate Without Profit: 617,082.00

Carpe Diem! <<...OLE_Obj...>>

Regina G. Blair  
Contracting Officer  
Department of the Army  
Chicago District, Corps of Engineers  
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206  
Telephone: (312) 353-6400 Ext. 1702  
Email Address: Regina.G.Blair@lrc02.usace.army.mil

9/17/2002
MEMORANDUM FOR: SEE DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-01-C-0001
Little Calumet River
Pump Stations Rehabilitation, Phase 1A
Hammond Sanitary District
Lake County, Indiana
Modification No. A00006 - Executed

1. Enclosed for your file is a copy of all pertinent information related to executed Modification No. A00006, under the subject contract.

2. Any questions concerning the enclosed items shall be directed to Mr. Robert B. Smolar at (219) 923-1763/4.

Thomas A. Deja, P.E.
Area Engineer
Calumet Area Office

Enclosures

Copies Furnished:
CELRC-TS-C-S (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-TS-C-C (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CT (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-PM-PM (Mod. Only) I. Samara
CELRC-TS-C-S (Mod. Only) R. Craib
CELRC-TS-C-C (Mod. Only) R. Smolar
LCRBDC (Mod. Only) J. Pokrajac
AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. A00006

3. EFFECTIVE DATE SEE BLOCK 16C

4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W81G6693015179

5. PROJECT NO. (If Applicable) 1-5

6. ISSUED BY CODE

CHICAGO DISTRICT SEE ABOVE 
111 North Canal Street USAED, Chicago (CO-5)
Suite 600 Calumet Area Office
Chicago, IL 60606-7206 906 Griffith Boulevard

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (Na., Street, County, State and Zip Code)

Overstreet Electric Co., Inc.
4220 N. Davis Highway Bldg. B
Pensacola, FL 32503

9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER

DACW27-01-C-0001 NA

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)

05 Oct 2000

11. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning ______ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitations and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA

See Page 2.

Contract Amount Increased $67,652.80.

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS

IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

X

B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).

(Such as changes in paying office.

C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return original and 3 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION

(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

Contract for Pump Station Rehabilitation, Phase 1A at Little Calumet River, Indiana.

Reference No. R00014

SS014 FC-01.11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 & 21

See Page 2.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

Sandra L. Peterson

15B. CONTRACTOR (Signature of person authorized to sign)

8/29/02

15C. DATE SIGNED

16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)

Thomas A. Deja, P.E.
Administrative Contracting Officer

16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

16C. DATE SIGNED

05 SEP 02

STANDARD FORM 30
(PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE)

REV. 10-83)

30-105-2

NSN 7540-01-156-8070

PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

21
MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

Contract No: DACW27-01-C-0001 NA
Modification No: A00006
Contractor: Overstreet Electric Co., Inc.
Contract Title: Pump Station Rehabilitation, Phase IA
Location: Little Calumet River, Indiana

h. Provide separate wiring and the proper voltage for pump station conductors.

D. CHANGE IN CONTRACT PRICE

Total contract price is increased by $67,652.80.

Unit Price Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIN No</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>CHANGE IN UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>CHANGE AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001L</td>
<td>Interior Electrical Work</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$21,686.67</td>
<td>$21,686.67</td>
<td>$21,686.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001N</td>
<td>Modify Float Tube</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$8,226.22</td>
<td>$4,372.36</td>
<td>$4,372.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003SL</td>
<td>Modifications to Discharge Box</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$4,458.88</td>
<td>$4,458.88</td>
<td>$4,458.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004N</td>
<td>New Mechanical Trash Rack</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$17,463.52</td>
<td>$17,463.52</td>
<td>$17,463.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004S</td>
<td>Interior Electrical Work</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$2,277.85</td>
<td>$2,277.85</td>
<td>$2,277.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New CLINs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLIN No</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>CHANGE AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0006</td>
<td>Clean Sediment &amp; Debris at Walnut Ave., Pump Station</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$1,458.88</td>
<td>$1,458.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0009</td>
<td>Separate Electric Conductors into Two Separate Conduits all Pump Stations</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$6,008.84</td>
<td>$6,008.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0010</td>
<td>Roof Drain Relocation at Kohman/Minister Ave., Pump Station</td>
<td>1.00 LS</td>
<td>$5,658.63</td>
<td>$5,658.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Change Amount: $67,652.80

E. CHANGE IN CONTRACT TIME

The contract completion date shall be extended by 30 calendar days by reason of this modification. This 30 calendar day extension revises the contract completion period/date from 8-26 calendar days/11 February 2003, as established by A00005, to 8-36 calendar days/13 March 2003.

F. CLOSING STATEMENT

It is further understood and agreed that this modification constitutes compensation in full on behalf of the Contractor, and its subcontractors and suppliers, for all cost and markups directly or indirectly attributable to the changes ordered herein, for all delays related thereto, and for performance of the changes within the time frame stated. The total estimated amount of the contract is INCREASED $67,652.80 from $4,743,171.99 to $4,810,824.79.

In accordance with the special contract requirements clause "CONTINUING CONTRACTS," funds are available only to the extent of specific amounts in formal notice to the Contractor. Under the provisions of the continuing contracts clause and other contract clauses the sum of $2,837,512.29 is reserved and available for payment.
MEMORANDUM FOR: See Distribution

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-01-C-0001
Pump Stations Rehabilitation, Phase IA
Hammond Sanitary Districts
Little Calumet River, Indiana
Modification No. P00011 - Executed

1. Enclosed for your files is a copy of all pertinent information related to executed Modification No. P00011, under the subject contract.

2. Any questions concerning the enclosed items shall be directed to Mr. Gary Anderson at (219) 923-1763 or 1764.

Enclosures

Distribution:

CELRC-CO-C (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CO-S (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CT (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-PM-M (Mod. Only) I. Samara
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) R. Smolar
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) R. Craib

LCRBDC (Mod. Only) J. Pokrajac

05 AUG 2002

* Current Money Available- $2,768,859.49

* Pump Station IA - Modification 11
* Continued funding increased by $600,000

Thomas A. Deja, P.E.
Area Engineer
Calumet Area Office.
A. SCOPE OF WORK

SS015  Continuing Contract Funding - $600,000
Continuing Contract Funding - This modification increases the amount available for payment by the sum of $600,000.00.

B. CHANGE IN CONTRACT PRICE

Total contract price is unchanged.

C. CHANGE IN CONTRACT TIME

The contract completion date shall remain unchanged by this modification. The current Contract completion date remains 11 February 2002, which was previously extended from the original Contract date of 08 October 2002.

D. CLOSING STATEMENT

As provided by special contract requirements clause "CONTINUING CONTRACTS," this modification INCREASES the amount available for payment under this Contract by the sum of $600,000. Under the provisions of this clause and other Contract clauses, the sum of $2,769,859.49 is reserved and available for payment.
Project Progress Update: 9-20-02

Pump Rehab 1B Contract C-0035 (Thieneman Const.)
Contract - 100% complete and closed.

Pump Rehab 1A Contract C-0001 (Overstreet Electric Co.)
Baring Ave Pump Station - 30%+- Complete.
1. Two new SWP pumps and motors have been received and are being stored.
2. The SWP-2 pump and motor has been removed.
3. New underground electrical service entrance duct bank has been installed.
4. Installation of new bar screen has begun.
5. New sump pump is being installed.
6. New flap valves have been installed.
7. Concrete discharge box modification work is continuing.
8. Two standby pumps have been transferred/installed from Hohman station and are ready for operation, if needed.

South Kennedy Ave Pump Station - 45%+- Complete.
1. Viking Engineering continues to resolve issues regarding pump performance of rebuilt pump #5. A different impeller is being installed to meet the contract’s pump performance requirements. Date for re-testing of this pump is still unknown.
2. New motor control center (MCC) has been set in place. Demolition of old and installation of new electrical equipment is complete until old pumps and motors have been replaced.
3. Concrete discharge box modifications are continuing.
4. The new mechanical trash has been set in place. Testing and Hammond’s “station operator training” will take place once permanent power is installed.

Hohman/Munster Pump Station- 70%+- Complete.
1. Startup/testing/turnover of the new SWP-1 and SWP-2 pumps and motors is complete.
2. DWP-2 pump and motor have been removed and a new concrete pump support is being installed.
3. The two standby pumps have been transferred to the Baring Ave station.
4. Ventilation ductwork continues to be removed and new ductwork is being installed.
5. Most electrical items are complete.

Walnut Ave. Pump Station - 55%+- Complete.
1. Viking Engineering has removed and rebuilt three pumps (#1, #2, and #3). It has been determined that the incorrect impellers have been installed. These impellers will need to be removed and the correct impellers installed in order to meet the contracts pump performance requirements. Viking is awaiting delivery of new impellers to replace the previously installed deficient impellers. Once new impellers are installed, factory testing of these pumps will be performed. No new information has been provided to the COE, this month, regarding this issue.
1. Concrete discharge box modification work is complete.
2. The old mechanical trash rack has been removed. Concrete modifications, to facilitate the installation of the new trash rack, are about complete. A new mechanical trash rack is being stored on site and should be installed soon.
North 5th Pump Station Rehab Contract C-0008 (Overstreet Engineering & Const.)
N.5th. Pump Station - 55%+- Complete.
1. Sub contractor "Piping Technologies" has previously removed various pumps & motors.
   New pump #1 and #2 are being installed.
2. Discharge piping for pump #1 and #2 is being installed.
3. Exterior concrete work, above the discharge boxes, is almost complete. Repairs have yet to be made.
4. New mechanical trash rack has been delivered and is stored on site.
5. Concrete reinforcement steel and forms are being installed in the inlet to the south wet well. This concrete work is needed to facilitate the installation of the new mechanical trash rack.
6. Demolition of old and installation of new electrical equipment continues.
7. Removal of old and installation of new ventilation ductwork has begun.
Hi Jim and Terry,

I apologize for Overstreet’s lack of overall production and timeliness of repairing construction deficiencies on the Phase 1A and N. 5th Ave. Pump Station Rehabilitation contracts awarded to Overstreet. We have been pressing Overstreet to make all efforts needed to increase their focus on production and quality. Their Project Manager, Morgan Overstreet, assured me that they will perform better in the future.

If we at USACE will ensure the end quality of all work performed meets the contract requirements and our customers are satisfied, prior to their final acceptance.

Sincerely,

Robert Craib

<<Progress of Pump Station Contracts - September 20, 2002..rtf>>
RESULTS OF REAL ESTATE MEETING
20 SEPTEMBER 2002
ARMY CORPS and LCRBDC

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

COE
Imad Samara
Chrystal Spokane

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS
Corps Realty Specialist Chrystal Spokane announced that:
- Attorney for the Corps Don Valk is now the Acting Chief of Acquisitions
- Roy Deda is the new Deputy of Project Management
- Linda Sorn is the new Chief of Project Management
- Lt. Col. Norm Grady is the new Deputy Engineer
- Joe Schmidt is the new Acting Chief of Technical Services
- Engineering, Design, Hydrology are now under "Technical Support"
- Real Estate and Planning are now under Project Management

Rumors abound and it's true that the Congressman has recommended cutting the Corps Chicago District by 37%. It's in legislation that may pass Congress. He wants the Corps to be more responsive to its "customers." LCRBDC should call Linda Sorn or Roy Deda if Imad is unavailable. Imad mentioned that the Corps is working on improving the Little Cal flood project web site.

1.) ACQUISITION UPDATES - PRIORITIES
- a. Stage VI-1 and 2 - Thirteen (13) of 17 residential are acquired, Kennedy Industrial Park appraisal will be submitted next week for review, and the appraiser will revise the Town of Highland appraisals as the Corps Reviewer has required.
- b. Mitigation – Appraiser has finished revisions on the first two appraisals. They'll be mailed overnight to the Corps reviewer on Monday.
- c. East Reach–On hold–closoing on offers already made-no new offers sent out.
- d. East Reach Remediation–On hold-no new offers–honor those offers sent.
- e. Burr Street–On hold-no new offers out–honor those offers already sent.
(ACTION: Judy/LCRBDC)
2.) **APPRaisal REVIEW STATUS**
   a. Judy has several outstanding appraisals in the review status. She’ll e-mail Corps Reviewer Greg Dorward in Pittsburgh for answers.
   (ACTION: Judy/LCRBDC)

   b. Status of:
      DC 83 approved for crediting
      DC 209 to 213-A appraiser making revisions
      DC 1198 (Wicker Park) needs further mapping and possible tree survey
      DC 216’s (A,B,E,F,G) need tax credit for 10 year sales history
      DC 289, 345, approved

   c. Lou suggested hiring review appraisers to assist with the workload. Chrystal explained that the appraisals must be reviewed and approved by Corps Reviewers.

   d. Lou mentioned that LCRBDC needs an MOU with the DNR about sending out mitigation land offers. Judy has received the DNR "Offer to Purchase" forms she requested for LCRBDC review and forwarded them to Lou. Since we’re buying land in the DNR name we need to use a DNR form to make the Kim and Fadell offers. A conference call to discuss the offers will be scheduled before any offers are made.
   (ACTION: COE and LCRBDC)

3.) **REVIEW OF ACQUISITION FUNDING TO SCHEDULING**
   Dan reported that the state called and asked us send in a budget request. Staff is working on the figures.
   (ACTION: LCRBDC)

4.) **MITIGATION**
   a. In-project – Imad reported that three bids were submitted for in—project mitigation. Low bidder is from Georgia, Dyer Construction came in third.
   b. Hobart Marsh – Judy reported that revisions on the Kim and Fadell appraisals are complete. Revised appraisals will be sent overnight to the Reviewer on Monday.
   (ACTION: Judy/LCRBDC)

5.) **CREDITING STATUS**
   Sandy distributed an update on crediting. Lorraine will calculate how many DC and DNR numbers are in the $2.7 million listed as non-creditable.
   (ACTION: Sandy and Lorraine/LCRBDC)
COE/LCRBDC ENGINEERING
COORDINATION REPORT
FOR MEETING ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2002
(Information in this Report is from August 28 – September 26, 2002)

GENERAL STATEMENT:
A. The COE put together a tracking plan for outstanding project issues that they gave to the LCRBDC for review and comment on June 6, 2002.

1. The LCRBDC added a number of items to this plan that will address, and summarize, the status of this report.

2. LCRBDC revised, summarized, and updated the modified the report and submitted it to the COE on September 4, 2002 to get their input. We are awaiting an update as of September 27, 2002
   - Refer to attached e-mail.

3. We will attach the completed tracking plan to the monthly report as soon as we receive all input.
From: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
To: "Samara, Imed LRC" <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, September 04, 2002 10:24 AM
Subject: Revisions to Business tracking plan

Imad:

I am faxing to you our most recent Business Process Tracking Plan. (I am unable to email it to you today because only Jim Flora's office has it and he is not in today). Jim Flora and I re-organized and modified the original plan as per our phone call between you, Dan and myself. This is very preliminary and we would hope that you could fill in some of the blanks, review and comment on what we have entered, and get any changes these back to me at your earliest convenience in order that I may hand out this preliminary plan to our Commissioners at our meeting tomorrow night. We have included items that are either no longer an issue or have been resolved but at least this would show we have made progress between us on a number of items. These can be eliminated after the first month. Call me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Jim Pokrajac

9/4/2002
October 1, 2002

Ms. Marilyn Schultz
State Budget Director
State Budget Agency
212 State House
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Ms. Schultz:

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission respectfully submits a capital funding request in the 2003-2005 State biennial budget of $7 million. This amount of new capital money is needed in addition to the $2.5 million restored from the 2001-03 capital budget to meet the Federal construction capability supported by Congressman Pete Visclosky.

The requested State capital appropriation would be spent on targeted priority project categories that have been set through discussions with the Corps of Engineers, Congressman Visclosky's office, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, and Governor O'Bannon's representatives. The dollars requested would go toward federally-credited items of needed non-federal participation to (1) obtain a Department of Natural Resources "construction in a floodway permit" for the entire five mile remaining reach of the project (covering the communities of Hammond, Highland and Munster); and (2) accomplish maximum property acquisition and utility relocations to spend for flood control construction the $21,054,300 the Corps of Engineers has earmarked for Federal fiscal Years 2003, 2004, and 2005 – the period covered by this State biennium.

The Development Commission clearly recognizes and appreciates the State's fiscal situation; but we feel funding for this project would leverage significant Federal construction monies, move significantly toward completing a project all acknowledge has extended too long (which causes increased project costs), and provide construction jobs and needed flood protection to over 7,000 homes, businesses and institutions in the heavily developed I-80/94 corridor.
At the direction of the State Budget Committee, the Development Commission is pursuing local contributions to assist in the non-federal costs of the project. We can assure you that the Development Commission and the local municipalities are sensitive to the financial situation and are committed to bringing local resources to supplement the State funding. To document this commitment, listed below are the ongoing initiatives and the estimated local dollar contributions.

A. Burr Street Betterment Levee, Phase 2 – Gary

**Description:** Compilation of last segment of levee in Gary. Not COE creditable due to "betterment".

**Action:** Mayor Scott King of Gary is pursuing use of $2,300,000+ of 2003 city casino revenue to complete non-federal commitment, which would finish the east reach of the project; allow the City of Gary to be removed from the floodplain; access $2,700,000 of federal construction monies; and fulfill a major piece toward obtaining a west reach "construction in a floodway" permit.

**Local Contribution:** $2,300,000+

B. West Reach Public Property Donation (Stages VI-1 and VI-2)

**Description:** The property needed for the west reach of the project includes several hundred acres owned by the Hammond Park Board and the Town of Highland.

**Action:** To approach each municipality to “donate” at no cost the rights of entry and use of the several hundred public acres. The property has just been appraised and the value of the land will be credited to the non-federal share.

**Local Contribution:**
- Hammond  -  + 10 acres  -  $242,000
- Highland  -  150 acres  -  $270,000

$512,000 Total

C. Highland/Hammond/Gary Pump Stations Operation

**Description:** The Development Commission has an agreement with the Town of Highland for operation and maintenance of 2 pump station facilities. We are now working on a similar agreement for the city of Hammond for operation of their pump stations. Also, Gary Sanitary District is in final negotiations to do the same for their pump stations.

**Local Contribution:** A savings of some $20,000/station or several hundred thousand dollars of local commitments will be made by the local sanitary districts.
In summary, the Development Commission is requesting the $7 million new capital funds and access to the $2.5 million from the 2001-2003 state to meet the federal construction capability of $21,054,300 in the period of the next state biennial budget. To clearly identify where the requested dollars would be spent, the following categories are earmarked. All categories are federally creditable.

**BUDGET REQUEST CATEGORIES**

- **Project Mitigation Acquisition at Hobart Marsh**
  - 18 tracts – 334 acres
  - $1,100,000

- **Project West Reach Land Acquisition**
  - Stage VI-1
    - 17 residential, 20 businesses
    - $1,000,000
  - Stage VI-2
    - 10 residential
    - $396,000
  - Stage V-2
    - 19 residential, 6 businesses
    - $1,254,000
  - Stage V-3
    - 1 corporate, 1 railroad
    - $1,750,000
    - **$4,400,000**

- **Utility Relocations**
  - 109 utility relocations
  - **$2,000,000**

- **Professional Services to Accomplish Acquisitions/Relocations**
  - **$700,000**

- **Non-Federal Cash Contribution (7% of Federal construction)**
  - **$1,500,000**

**TOTAL NEED**

- **$9,500,000**

Attached for further documentation is the spreadsheet showing Corps of Engineers spending over the next three Federal Fiscal years with the non-federal requirements also listed.

Members of the Development Commission stand ready to come to Indianapolis to explain this submission or testify to any budget hearings. Thank you for your consideration of this submission.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

Encl.
Cc: Congressman Viacosly's Office
    Senator Lugar's Office
    Senator Bayh's Office
    N.W. IN State Legislative delegation
    Jeff Violi, Governor's Office
    Beth Compton, Governor's Office
    Sean Falvey, IDNR
# LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND RECREATION PROJECT

## PROJECTED FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL FUNDING REQUIRED FOR

**FISCAL YEARS 2003, 2004 and 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>TOTAL CONTRACT COST</th>
<th>FY 03 Fed</th>
<th>1002-03 FY</th>
<th>FY 04 Fed</th>
<th>1003-04 FY</th>
<th>FY 05 Fed</th>
<th>1004-05 FY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total PF</td>
<td>Non-Fed</td>
<td>Total PF</td>
<td>Non-Fed</td>
<td>Total PF</td>
<td>Non-Fed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Reach Dam</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 North</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 South</td>
<td>$4,286,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 1</td>
<td>$2,009,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 2</td>
<td>$2,670,567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1A</td>
<td>$4,714,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1B</td>
<td>$2,041,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 5th Pump Sta.</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Labor - Professional Services</td>
<td>$501,010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E Contracts</td>
<td>$1,183,063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II-1</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-3</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation-Hobart Marsh</td>
<td>$501,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III Remediation</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 3</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,470,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $19,411,798, $5,210,720

*This work is being done on project lands*

**Burp Street Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Design Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4,994,000</td>
<td>$484,000</td>
<td>$263,000</td>
<td>$5,741,000</td>
<td>$5,741,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$76,700</td>
<td>(Grace St. Pump Stations)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-federal costs are shown by category in the 2nd year of the biennium for clarity.
**Option #1**

200 acres ± Chase Street to Grant Street

Signed 12/03/98

Five (5) year Option

$21,500.00 per annum

Lake Erie may terminate after two (2) years with written one (1) year notice.

Option to License – License has termination clause without cause – LCRBDC may terminate without cause or giving notice, providing hearing, and paying appraised value of improvements

(Note: Option never exercised: Termination clause in license cannot be used)

**Option #2**

09/09/99

Five (5) year Option

$45,460.00 per annum

(Does not include area described in Option #1)

**Addendum #1 to Option #2**

Provides for modification of Option #2 by immediately exercising Option regarding 32 acres describe in “Addendum - Exhibit B”

Provides for reduction of Option price by $2,800.00 per annum due to removal of 32 acres ±
REAL ESTATE ISSUES EXECUTIVE SESSION
October 3, 2002
4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Lake Erie Land letters describing position on Hobart Marsh mitigation
   • Lake Erie Land has requested extension of option with Development Commission
   • Recommendation – Request meeting with LEL leadership/attorney to determine feasibility of their even obtaining necessary permits to create the wetland bank

2. Review/Recommend approval of agreement between Development Commission and Indiana Department of Natural Resources for acquisition procedures regarding Hobart Marsh properties

3. Review/Recommend approval of offer on Kim property in Hobart Marsh
   • COE review appraiser has approved credit of appraisal amount
   • Second appraisal (Fadell property) also approved by COE

4. Other Issues
Dear Lou,

LEL would agree to increase the annual option payment by $20 per acre, starting with the next payments due in September and December if both options were extended to 2007 and all of the stipulations in the original agreements were to remain in effect.

Thanks,

Don Ewoldt
September 27, 2002

Dr. Mark Reshkin, Chairman
Environmental Committee
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN 46368

RE: Hobart Marsh Lands

Dear Dr. Reshkin:

I am writing in response to your request for a written letter of support concerning the LCRBDC’s use of the Hobart Marsh Lands for the flood protection and recreation project’s compensatory mitigation.

To clarify our position, Lake Erie Land Company fully supports the use of any and all Hobart Marsh Lands that meet the criteria and conditions of the DNR permit (#FW-16, 167). We have also supported and continue to support the Conceptual Mitigation Plan (August 1998). We do not, however, support the Application for Project Mitigation (August 2001), as we understand that it was never publicly reviewed, does not meet the special conditions in the above referenced permit, and generally does not conform to the Conceptual Plan.

Lake Erie Land Company is willing to help your efforts in this matter, and has the resources and experience to do so.

Sincerely,

Don Ewoldt
Vice-President
Wetland Banking
Lake Erie Land Company
SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Property Owners and Mailing Addresses:

DC-M-01 Kim Howard Hee Han Et Al
34 Ramsgate Drive
Palos Park, Illinois 60464

Property Identification:
Two vacant parcels located in the Hobart Marsh Area

Property Location:
East of Liverpool Road and south of 53rd Avenue (as extended) in Hobart, Indiana

Effective Date of Value:
August 4, 2002

Date of the Report:
August 8, 2002

Property Rights Appraised:
Fee simple land value

Current Use:
The parcels consist of vacant land which is covered with field growth.

Property Descriptions

Land:
63.94 acres

Zoning:
R2, Single Family Residential District

Highest and Best Use:
Agricultural, considering a zoning change

Valuation Conclusions

Market Value:
$224,000

In this valuation, we have only used the sales comparison approach, which is most commonly used to value vacant land. The income approach values the property according to its net income. This property might generate some low income, but it is not the type of property that would interest an investor. In the cost approach the depreciated improvement value is added to the land value, and here there are no improvements.

Photographs

The subject photographs are as follows:

Janet O'Toole & Associates
SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Property Owners and Mailing Addresses:

DC-M-03  Barbara Fadell
            633 North 70th East
            Valparaiso, Indiana 46383

Property Identification: Three vacant parcels located in the Hobart Marsh Area

Property Location: East of I-65 and north of 49th Avenue in Hobart, Indiana

Effective Date of Value: August 4, 2002

Date of the Report: August 12, 2002

Property Rights Appraised: Fee simple land value

Current Use: The parcel consists of vacant land which is covered with field growth and mature trees.

Property Descriptions

Land: 49.66 acres

Zoning: B3, Highway Oriented Business District

Highest and Best Use: Agricultural use

Valuation Conclusions

Market Value: $184,000

Valuation Approaches: In this valuation, we have only used the sales comparison approach, which is most commonly used to value vacant land. The income approach values the property according to its net income. This property might generate some low income, but it is not the type of property that would interest an investor. In the cost approach the depreciated improvement value is added to the land value, and here there are no improvements.

Photographs

The subject photographs are as follows:

Janet O'Toole & Associates
## 2002 Earnings for Judy Vamos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CK#</th>
<th>Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2002</td>
<td>7440</td>
<td>2,755.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2002</td>
<td>7455</td>
<td>3,741.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2002</td>
<td>7461</td>
<td>3,412.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2002</td>
<td>7477</td>
<td>1,998.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/2002</td>
<td>7483</td>
<td>2,737.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/2002</td>
<td>7506</td>
<td>2,573.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/2002</td>
<td>7516</td>
<td>3,266.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/2002</td>
<td>7541</td>
<td>3,266.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/31/2002</td>
<td>7553</td>
<td>3,246.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/2002</td>
<td>7572</td>
<td>3,412.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/1/2002</td>
<td>7586</td>
<td>2,883.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2002</td>
<td>7617</td>
<td>2,883.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1/2002</td>
<td>7637</td>
<td>3,029.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2002</td>
<td>7661</td>
<td>3,887.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/30/2002</td>
<td>7671</td>
<td>3,175.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/13/2002</td>
<td>7686</td>
<td>3,431.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2002</td>
<td>7696</td>
<td>2,774.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16/2002</td>
<td>7717</td>
<td>3,394.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/1/2002</td>
<td>7737</td>
<td>3,449.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2002</td>
<td>7749</td>
<td>3,814.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2/2002</td>
<td>7767</td>
<td>2,865.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 68,346.25
MINUTES OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
HELD AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2002
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, INDIANA

Chairman William Tanke called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Seven (7) commissioners were present. Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Quorum was declared and guests were recognized.

**Development Commissioners:**
William Tanke
Robert Huffman
Mark Reshkin
George Carlson
Steve Davis
Arlene Colvin
Robert Marszalek

**Visitors:**
Jim Flora – R.W.Armstrong Company
Sandy O'Brien - Hobart
Don Ewoldt – Lake Erie Land Company
Imad Samara - COE
Mark Lopez – Congressman Visclosky's Office
Bob Blaessing - COE
Elizabeth McCloskey – U.S. Fish & Wildlife
Dave Taborski – Gary resident
Glenn & Patricia Stotts – Gary residents
Bill Petrites – Highland resident

The minutes of the August 1st meeting were approved by a motion from Bob Huffman; motion seconded by Mark Marszalek; motion passed unanimously.

**Chairman’s Report** – Chairman Bill Tanke stated there was no Chairman’s Report.

**Executive Director’s Report** – Executive Director Dan Gardner informed the Board that staff is continuing to monitor our expenditures from the budget that was put together with remaining state monies available to the Commission. We are doing priority spending only.

- Regarding mitigation, Mr. Gardner referred to Committee Chairman Mark Reshkin. Mr. Reshkin reported that 2 meetings have been held, on August 14th and August 30th. Attendance included the COE, IDNR, IDEM, IN Dunes National Lakeshore, LEL, several Commission/committee members, SHEF, Trust for Public Land, Sandy O'Brien that were either invited or attended. The mitigation plan was re-evaluated and re-affirmed using Hobart Marsh area. The attorney has been researching several mitigation issues that were brought up. It was also important to look for partners to carry out the mitigation plan. We have just received a letter today from Trust for Public Land, indicating they are interested in partnering with us in order to move along the plans for acquisition in the Hobart Marsh area. It was stated that in order to show “good faith effort”, land must be purchased for mitigation. Although funds are limited, staff has "earmarked" $250,000 in the priority budget spending to allow for mitigation land purchase. Several appraisals have been done and the COE is in the process of reviewing those appraisals. Once they are approved, we can make an offer to purchase. Once an offer is accepted, we will ask the COE to do a management plan at that time. Another Environmental meeting will be scheduled shortly.

- In regards to Burr Street Phase 2 build-out, we continue to pursue funds from the City of Gary in early 2003 (most likely from the city's casino funds) to allow for Phase 2 construction. By completing Burr Street, it will not only be the last piece of the puzzle for Gary to come out of the floodplain, but it will enable us to move forward with the IDNR permit for the west reach levee construction. Mayor King has indicated support.

- In regards to crediting, staff is continuing to credit all prior expenditures to recapture monies that have been spent. Discussions are still ongoing with the FHWA. Mr. Gardner has talked to Jeff Viohl from the Governor's Washington
office, and he has volunteered to see if he can help us out by talking to INDOT directly. At the worse case scenario, we are able to get 20% credit.

- Staff is also working on the submittal of the IDNR permit for the west reach. There will be about 1,000 people to contact via certified mail. Once the contact is made with the residents by mail, we anticipate we will be getting many telephone calls. We will work with the elected officials of the communities affected to keep them updated.
- Commissioner Bob Huffman asked Mr. Gardner if we would be in the Mayor’s city budget for funding for Burr Street and whether we would have to make a presentation to the City Council. Mr. Gardner replied that the Mayor indicated he would pursue casino monies (not the city’s budgeted monies) when that budget is put together in January. We will follow the Mayor’s lead in addressing the Council members. Council approval is needed.

**Old Business** – Attorney Lou Casale read a letter he wrote addressing whether it would be prudent for the Commission to cancel its liability and property insurance, as well as the D&O liability insurance. After researching the matter and talking to the Chief Legal Counsel for the IDNR, he has recommended that we continue insurance coverage. (The question arose when Mr. Fahey suggested that the Commission did not need to carry separate insurance due to exemptions and immunities provided by the Indiana Tort Claims Immunity Act, as per legal advice provided by the Chief Legal Counsel for the IDNR.)

- Discussion ensued on whether the Commission wanted to increase the liability limit to $2 mil/$3 mil for an additional premium of around $7,500. After discussing, Commissioner Steve Davis stated that he was asked by IDNR management to request that we put off a vote until next meeting. Mr. Huffman made a motion to defer the matter to the Finance Committee until next month; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously.
- Jim Pokrajac is working with the attorney to get a legal description of the ditch by Village Shopping Center. It has been determined that they are not, nor can they be, tied into the city lines.

**Land Acquisition/Land Management Committee** – Committee Chairman Arlene Colvin gave the report. She made a motion to increase an offer on DC1034 from $1200 to $2150 to cover the loss of a tree; motion seconded by Steve Davis; motion passed unanimously. Ms. Colvin then made a motion to authorize the condemnation on this same property if the owner does not take the increased offer; motion seconded by Bob Marszalek. Commissioner Steve Davis abstained from voting. Commissioner Bob Huffman also abstained. Commissioner George Carlson also abstained. Discussion followed. Mr. Davis stated that he is getting a clarification from Indianapolis on whether it is a conflict if he votes on condemnations. (He has normally abstained on condemnation votes in the past). Mr. Huffman stated that he thinks the condemnation vote should be only after we know for sure that the property owner refuses the increased offer and not have both motions made in the same night. Mr. Carlson asked the attorney the difference between abstaining and voting no and Mr. Casale replied that an abstention vote goes with the majority. Mr. Carlson proceeded to change his vote to no. The vote passed with the majority approving the condemnation (only if the condemnation is necessary).
- Mr. Marszalek made a motion to complete Phase 2 of the Charles Agnew Handicapped Park at a quoted cost of $44,000. Monies will be used from the LEL account and repaid back to the account from LEL once credits are sold; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.
- Ms. Colvin made a motion approving 3 contracts to be paid out of LEL funds. They are (1) $3,500 to C&H Mowing to do a second and final mowing this fall, (2) $650 to Congress Enterprises to clear debris from Commission property and (3) $150 to South Shore Marina for posting of signs on Commission property. Motion seconded by Steve Davis; motion passed unanimously.
- The Colfax to Calhoun ditch has been cleaned out and inspected in response to landowners petition several months past.

**Project Engineering Committee** – Committee Chairman Bob Huffman gave the engineering report. He reported that we had received a memo from Highland indicating local concern/disatisfaction with the COE’s contractor, Overstreet, regarding work quality, scheduling and communications. Several meetings were held and all appears to be resolved.

- Plans have been received from INDOT for their project along Indianapolis Blvd. in Highland. The plans did not
include the storm sewer and lift station design but they will be forwarded in early October when finalized).
* A FEMA meeting was held on August 23 at the Lake County Surveyor’s Office to discuss the re-mapping of floodplains in Lake County. It was stated at the meeting that the process could begin for Gary to be taken out of the floodplain once a commitment is made for 100% funding and the levee project construction is 50% completed. We need a written commitment from Mayor King to begin the process of removing Gary from the floodplain.

**Legislative Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson gave the legislative report. He reported that the Committee met yesterday to devise strategy for a legislative approach. Mr. Carlson went over the agenda from that meeting. He referred to the credit sheet in which staff is continuing to update each month as credit which is then submitted and approved by the COE. He also referred to the priority spending budget sheet in which staff is monitoring how dollars are being spent. He also referred to a budget sheet that staff is working on to match estimated dollar amounts to the COE’s schedule in order to reach a figure for the state budget request. Mr. Gardner added that the COE schedule is being finalized and will be shared with us at a meeting on September 13th. At that time, we can finalize our budget request based on the new COE schedule. We have not met with any area legislators yet to discuss future state funding. We know the picture looks bleak but we need to continue working on acquiring property in the Stage VI area and properties in the Hobart Marsh area.

**Recreation Committee** – In Committee Chairman Emerson Delaney’s absence, Bob Huffman gave the report. He reported that we submitted a plan to the COE for a ramp in the Stage VI-2 levee to tie into the Highland trail system. Highland had already approved the plan.
* A letter was sent to North Township requesting written confirmation that we can tie our trail into the existing Wicker Park trail, thus saving quite a bit of money. It was stated by Imad Samara that we would complete the ramp as part of our Stage VI-2 project, but that the town of Highland would be responsible to connect their trail from Liable to our ramp. We have not had a response yet from North Township.
* Mr. Huffman asked whether the recreation trail would be included with the Burr Street Phase 2 project. Mr. Pokrjac explained that the COE will build the trail as part of the Phase 2 levee construction but will be paid for through separate funding. The completion of the trail from Martin Luther King Drive to the EJ&E RR will be completed except for the Grant Street and Broadway crossings which will be done as part of the Recreation Phase 2 project.

**Marina Committee** – Committee Chairman Bill Tanke requested approval of the October 1st marina revenue bond payment. Steve Davis made a motion to approve the payment of $28,643.84; motion seconded by Arlene Colvin; motion passed unanimously. Mr. Tanke continued to say that the tentative meeting that was scheduled with Bank One to pursue the buildout of the marina was cancelled; more financial information is needed from the city. Mr. Gardner has been in contact with John Smolnar from the Portage Port Authority and they are pursuing obtaining the financial information that is needed. A meeting will be scheduled once that information is received.

**Finance Committee** – In Committee Chairman Curt Vosti’s absence, Mr. Gardner referred to the financial statement and the claim sheet. Bob Marszalek proceeded to make a motion approving the claim sheet for August with total claims being $52,656.22; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.
* Mr. Gardner added that the Audit Report for years 1998, 99, 00, and 01 has been received and there were no negative findings. There are a few minor bookkeeping and reporting issues that will be changed to reflect State Board of Accounts recommendations, but nothing of significance. Copies of the audit are public record and as such, are available upon request.

**Environmental Committee** – Committee Chairman Mark Reshkin’s report was given earlier.
* Mr. Reshkin asked whether standing water from the river posed a problem for the West Nile virus to appear. Mr. Gardner speculated that we could probably assist the city of Gary with funds for spraying mosquitoes if they needed. Arlene Colvin will check with the city.
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* Attorney Casale read his memo to the Board members regarding his legal opinion as to the question of whether or not there exists a regulation or statute that would prevent the Commission and a third party from entering into an agreement to develop wetland mitigation banking on Commission property. His conclusion was that he has been unable to find such a regulation/statute prohibiting us from entering into an agreement. Further discussion will take place at the next committee meeting.

**Policy Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson stated that his committee met prior to tonight’s meeting. One item that was discussed was to eliminate the words “as determined” from the bylaws (Item #3 in the bylaws, under Authorization to Travel). He thinks that it is too broad and open to leave in the term “as determined” The Board members only should have the authority to appoint a party to attend a conference. After discussion with the committee, it was decided to address this issue if and when it ever comes up again. Mr. Carlson proceeded to make a motion that approved sending Bob Marszalek to the NAFSMA conference; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.

**Public Relations Committee** – Committee Chairman Bob Marszalek stated that there was no report.

**Other Issues** – Commissioner Huffman requested if it was possible to e-mail him the Land Acquisition/ Management Work Study agenda prior to the meeting. Judy Vamos will comply.

**New Business** – Executive Director Dan Gardner referred to the letter from USGS requesting an agreement be put in place to allow the Commission to pay USGS directly (instead of going through IDNR) for the 2 gage stations on the Little Calumet River that we have paid for many years. In view of the situation, that this is not a creditable item and, therefore, cannot be drawn from the State, there is no mechanism in place for us to obtain the monies. We need to talk to IDNR about how to deal with this. Mr. Gardner was instructed to write a letter to USGS informing them of the budget situation, with Mark Reshkin, Bill Tanke, Steve Davis and Lou Casale approving it before it is mailed out and copy the letter to Sean Fahey, Beth Compton, and Jeff Viohl. Commissioner Mark Reshkin cautioned us to move carefully as the gage stations play an important role in TMDL’s.

**Statements to the Board** – Sandy O’Brien expressed concern that enough money will not be offered to property owners in Hobart Marsh and fears they will not accept an offer. She says that since the appraisals are just based on MLS listings and not actual private sales, the offers will be too low. Commissioner Reshkin asked her to make her concerns known to Judy Vamos, who is coordinating the appraisals/offers.

Liz McCloskey – Inquired how the recreation trail will cross the EJ&E tracks. Jim Pokrajac answered that we have a letter from EJ&E that will allow us to cross their tracks as long as they are held harmless and in compliance with their safety standards. The attorneys will work out that language when the time comes.

Mr. Stotts, property owner along Colfax to Calhoun, commented on the ditch cleaning behind those properties. Although the dirt was cleaned out from the ditch, he stated that there is still standing water. Jim Pokrajac added that the ditch was satisfactorily cleaned out but there is still some water because the slope of the ditch is so flat. He will work with the COE/contractor at the final inspection to see if anything else can be done to improve the situation. Chairman Tanke asked Imad to get elevations relative to design in that area to check on settlement and work with Jim Pokrajac to coordinate.

Sandy O’Brien – Stated that she was pleased that we are looking into Trust for Public Land. She suggested that we hold off on making any offers in Hobart Marsh and wait for Trust for Public Land to do it. Mr. Gardner added that we are under scrutiny with State officials to begin purchasing mitigation property.

There being no further business, the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, October 3, 2002.
September 24, 2002

Greg Zoeller, Chief Counsel Advisory Division
Office of the Attorney General
Indiana Government Center South
Fifth Floor
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, IN 46204

RE: Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission Insurance

Dear Mr. Zoeller:

Pursuant to our telephone conversation of this date, I enclosed herein a memorandum recently produced by my law offices pertaining to the question of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission’s need for insurance. I have also enclosed a cover letter to the chairman of our Commission recommending that, under current conditions, our liability insurance policy be maintained. During our conversation you indicated that a letter from the Attorney General’s office reiterating the opinion in said memorandum; to wit, that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, as a public body corporate and politic, may buy liability insurance, but is covered by the immunities granted under the Indiana Tort Liability Claims Act, may be useful in reducing insurance rates.

You also indicated that there might be a possibility that the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission may qualify for coverage under the Indiana Tort Claims Fund. If this were the case, claims, costs and damages would be paid by the Tort Claim Fund for all liabilities which are not covered under the immunities outlined in the Tort Claims Act. Obviously, a more detailed analysis of the Commission’s position in this respect is necessary and would be greatly appreciated from your office.

A formal Attorney General’s opinion is not necessary in this instance, however, a letter reinforcing my opinion that the Commission falls under the protection of the Tort Claims Act as
well as the Attorney General's opinion regarding whether or not coverage under the Tort Claims Fund would be available to the Commission would be greatly appreciated.

Please contact me with any questions you may have regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

CASALE, WOODWARD & BULS, LLP

[Signature]

Louis M. Casale

cc: Dan Gardner
    William Tanke
    Sean Fahey
    Carrie Doehrmann
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Phase</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Award</th>
<th>Length of Levee, LF</th>
<th>Construction Completed</th>
<th>Earthen Levee, LF</th>
<th>Floodwall, LF</th>
<th>Pump Station, Qty</th>
<th>Sluice Gate, Qty/Size</th>
<th>Flap Gate, Qty/Size</th>
<th>Culverts, Qty/Size</th>
<th>Closure Structures, Type</th>
<th>Flowage Easements, Type</th>
<th>Recreational Features, Type</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Features</th>
<th>Channel Maint. &amp; Debris Removal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II-1</td>
<td>Broadway to Harrison Levee</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>Sept.-91</td>
<td>1,895 lin. ft.</td>
<td>July-92</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2</td>
<td>Harrison to Grant Levee</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>Aug.-92</td>
<td>2,686 lin. ft.</td>
<td>April-94</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-46'</td>
<td>1-46'</td>
<td>3-36'</td>
<td>1-16'</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3A</td>
<td>Georgia to MLK Drive</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>June-94</td>
<td>3,680 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Sept.-95</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Grant to Chase Levee</td>
<td>North Levee &amp; South Levee</td>
<td>Sept.-92</td>
<td>16,060 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Dec.-95</td>
<td>16,060</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-1</td>
<td>Indpls. Blvd.-Conrail</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>Sept.-93</td>
<td>2,500 lin. ft.</td>
<td>June-95</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Black Oak</td>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>May-95</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Sept.-95</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3B</td>
<td>Harrison to Georgia Levee</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>Aug.-95</td>
<td>3,200 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Sept.-98</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3C-2</td>
<td>Broadway to Harrison Levee</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>Dec.-95</td>
<td>3,200 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Dec.-98</td>
<td>3,086</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3-48'</td>
<td>3-48'</td>
<td>2-10'</td>
<td>2-42' flexible</td>
<td>2-42'</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4</td>
<td>Broadway to MLK Drive</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>Aug.-95</td>
<td>11,600 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Nov.-98</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-2A</td>
<td>Burr to Clark Levee</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>Sept.-95</td>
<td>2,600 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Nov.-98</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-2B</td>
<td>Clerk to Chase Levee</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>June-98</td>
<td>6,132 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Dec.-98</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3-60'</td>
<td>3-60'</td>
<td>3-60'</td>
<td>3-24'</td>
<td>Sandbag</td>
<td>@ Clark</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Completed Levee Segments</td>
<td>Sept.-95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>June-96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Separate Community Facilities</td>
<td>Mar.-97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sept.-98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Misc. Land Improvements</td>
<td>May-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Reach Rem.</td>
<td>W. of I-65 N. of River Levee</td>
<td>Horse-shoe Levee around Marshall-town</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>4,650 lin. ft.</td>
<td>Jan.-00</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 North</td>
<td>W. of Colfax to Burr St.</td>
<td>Drainage Swale &amp; Culverts</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 South</td>
<td>W. of EJ&amp;E to Burr St.</td>
<td>North Levee</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr St. Phase I</td>
<td>W. of EJ&amp;E to Colfax</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr St. Phase II</td>
<td>Colfax to ½ Bot. Burr &amp; Clark</td>
<td>South Levee</td>
<td>Apr.-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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