MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AT 6:00 P.M. TUESDAY, JULY 9, 2002
AT THE COMMISSION OFFICE
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, IN

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 June 6, 2002

5. Chairman’s Report
   - Report on Commission Special meeting held on June 28th

6. Executive Director’s Report
   - Burr Street/city of Gary funding meeting
     > 100 & 200 yr. before and after floodplain elevations and acreages, funding situation
   - Update – Project Mitigation Status
     > In-project mitigation re-bid process
   - Illinois-Deep Tunnel groundbreaking – South suburbs
     > Offer for presentation of Illinois project – Frank Gaweda – MSD of Greater Chicago

7. Old Business
   - O&M issue at Colfax-Calhoun drainage ditch
   - Status of disposition of property
   - Follow-up on INDOT/Tri-State project at Indianapolis Blvd.
   - Report on property liability insurance update
8. Standing Committees

A. Land Acquisition/Management Committee – Arlene Colvin, Chairperson

- **Land Acquisition**
  - Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
  - COE Real Estate meeting held on June 27
  - Committee meeting held 6/10/02 report

- **Land Management**
  - Inter-local agreement between us and Highland for pump station turnover
  - Update on property leases
  - Other Issues

B. Project Engineering Committee – Bob Huffman, Chairman

- Update on 75’ drainage easement – Lou Casale
- Pump Station 1B union concerns
- Status of COE/LCRBDC tracking program
- Final GSD coordination meeting minutes of June 6, 2002
- Utility coordination meeting held 6/12 & 25/02
- Other Issues

C. Legislative Committee – George Carlson, Chairman

- Budget passes Special Session – Funding prospects for $2.5 million
- 2003-04 State Budget request preparation
- Other Issues

D. Recreational Development Committee – Emerson Delaney, Chairman

- No recreational work scheduled until Recreation Phase 2 is released
- Other Issues

E. Marina Development Committee – Bill Tanke, Chairman

- Portage Public Marina update
  - Schedule meeting with Bank One for bonding review
- Other issues

F. Finance Committee – Curt Vosti, Chairman

- Financial status report
- Approval of claims for June 2002
- COE letter withdrawing $100,000 from construction escrow account
- Other Issues

G. Environmental Committee – Mark Reshkin, Chairman

- Attorney review of COE letter re: 401 Water Quality Certification requirement
- Other Issues

H. Policy Committee – George Carlson, Chairman

- Amended By-Laws distributed
- Other Issues

I. Public Relations Committee – Bob Marszalek, Chairman

- Public Newsletter
- Issues

9. Other Issues
10. New Business
11. Statements to the Board from the Floor
12. Set date for next meeting
Chairman William Tanke called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Ten (10) Commissioners were present. Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Quorum was declared and guests were recognized.

**Development Commissioners:**
- William Tanke
- John Mroczkowski
- Mark Reshkin
- Bob Marszalek
- Steve Davis
- Emerson Delaney
- Arlene Colvin
- Robert Huffman
- George Carlson
- Marion Williams

**Visitors:**
- Bill Petrites – Highland resident
- JoMary Crary, IDNR, Div. of Water
- Don Ewoldt – Lake Erie Land
- Imad Samara - ACOE
- Sandy O’Brien - Hobart
- Jim Flora – R.W. ARMSTRONG CO.

**Staff:**
- Dan Gardner
- Sandy Mordus
- Jim Pokrajac
- Judy Vamos
- Lou Casale

The minutes of the May 2nd meeting were approved by a motion from Arlene Colvin; motion seconded by Bob Marszalek; motion passed unanimously.

**Chairman’s Report** – Chairman Tanke referred to attorney Lou Casale for a report on the insurance coverage that the Commission has. Mr. Casale reported that he has talked to the insurance agent and has him getting some quotes together to increase the director’s and officers’ liability policy to $3 million per person/$5 million per occurrence. He is also checking into several other questions that Lou had. We hope to have the information for the next Board meeting.

**Executive Director’s Report** - Executive Director Dan Gardner reported on the recent rains the area received. Jim Pokrajac displayed some pictures he had taken of the flooding areas, namely, Wicker Park golf course, Woodmar Country Club, and some streets in the Burr Street levee area. He reported the COE has calculated this to be a 5-year flood event. Commissioner Reshkin asked how the flooding was in areas that had completed levee segments in them and was told that those areas did fare better. He also requested staff get photos in these areas during the next event. They might have had standing water a couple of inches deep but receded much quicker. With the project in place, the duration was much shorter. Some of the pictures portrayed the flooded area at Indianapolis Blvd. and 81st Street in Highland. Mr. Gardner added that we need to schedule a meeting with the town of Highland to talk about a remedy to the flooding.
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• Mr. Gardner stated that now that we have had a meeting today with Gary Sanitary District, we will be scheduling a meeting with the Mayor. Although construction of Burr Street levee, Phase 2 is the priority subject to talk to the Mayor about, we also need to talk about the GSD issues and mitigation. Mr. Gardner will try to schedule that meeting within a couple of weeks. Arlene Colvin requested she be kept in the loop.

• Mr. Gardner distributed a letter from Ray Coughenour and Imad Samara listing out a "business tracking plan" format to track key issues while trying to resolve them. Since we have just received it tonight, staff will look it over to see if changes need to be made.

• Mr. Gardner talked about a retreat meeting for the Commission members. There are several key issues that need discussing. A date will be set.

Old Business – Regarding the drainage ditch area that lies between Coltfox and Calhoun, north of the Norfolk Southern RR, Mr. Gardner stated that we have received a petition signed by those residents in that area. We will be responding to them.

• Regarding the storm water issue, Mr. Gardner stated that we are awaiting rules from IDEM, which should be available by the end of the year. Mark Reshkin added that responsible agencies have to submit a plan by next year and they will have 1 year to develop that plan. The role in which the Commission may participate in may be under Rule 13 that provides public outreach to the citizens.

• Regarding the clean-up of Lyles property, Jim Pokrajac reported that the clean-up has been completed.

• The attorney is working on the disposal of property procedure. Mr. Casale stated that his office has sent a required notice to different agencies. Within 30-60 days, he is hoping the process will allow us to sell off any surplus property we have. The initial property that we would like to sell is the rental house located at 3120 Gerry Street that we own and those renters living there would like to purchase it. Status of progress will be reported.

• Mr. Gardner asked Imad Samara the status of the in-project mitigation contract award. Imad stated that 4 bids were received; 3 were ruled out; negotiations were taking place with the 1 technically-qualified contractor but a fair and acceptable price with them could not be reached. The COE does plan to re-bid the project. Some changes will be made to the original specs. One change would be to separate the improvements from the O&M from the project. Mr. Tanke inquired about the time table to re-bid. Imad replied that probably by the end of August, a contractor could be selected. Another pre-bid meeting will also have to be scheduled.

Land Acquisition/Management Committee – Committee Chairperson Arlene Colvin made a motion to approve an increased offer on DC483 from $4296 to $8985 (owner rejected original flowage easement; wants to sell in fee); motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously. There are no condemnations.

• Ms. Colvin reported that continuing efforts are being made in regard to the mitigation land in the Hobart Marsh area. Judy Vamos has sent out letters for request to survey and appraise.

• Ms. Colvin reported that several Boy Scout troops had their annual outing on June 1st and cleaned up the levee and placed wood chip trails on top of the levee in Stage VII. The Commission furnished pizza to the Scouts for a job well done.

• Two agreements were entered into this month with Area Plumbing for $3582 (to finish work on the DC448 Taborski property) and South Shore Marina for $1,313 (to secure roadways on Commission property).
Project Engineering Committee – Committee Chairman Bob Huffman gave the engineering report. He reported that our attorney is continuing efforts with the Lake County Surveyor’s Office and Lake County Attorney John Dull in an effort for them to establish a 75’ drainage easement in certain areas needed for the project.
• Mr. Huffman reported that the meeting with Gary Sanitary District was held on June 6th. All 7 remaining items that had not been previously addressed were discussed. Tasks have been assigned to appropriate people to try to resolve the remaining issues.
• Mr. Huffman reported that we have received as-built drawings from the COE for Stag IV-1 North. We still have some engineering concerns regarding the drainage ditch at Colfax to Calhoun.
• Mr. Huffman referred to the email received from INDOT regarding their position on a pump station in the Tri State area at Indianapolis Blvd. in Highland. Discussion centered on having a meeting with John Bach, Highland Public Works Director, to discuss this further. INDOT plans to put a lift station, not a pump station, in the area. Staff would follow up to see if Highland has interest.
• A modified report of the minority participation information was discussed. A new format was established that appears to be easier reading and understanding.

Legislative Committee – Committee Chairman George Carlson referred to the response letter we received from Betty Cockrum, Director of the State Budget Agency. It indicates that the $2.5 million is indeed not available to the Commission.
• He also referred to the Times editorial entitled “A drought of funding for flooding projects”. With the recent heavy rains we just experienced, the article spoke of the levees that are in place are working well but it has been a struggle to acquire enough state funding to match the federal funding. A special legislative session is ongoing now and it is hoped that some kind of an acceptable revenue reinstatement can emerge from it.
• Mr. Gardner added that he attended a session at Purdue Cal sponsored by the city of Hammond and the university entitled “Alliance for Indiana’s Future”. There are 7 meetings that are being held around the state.

Recreational Development Committee – Committee Chairman Emerson Delaney stated that there are no recreation contracts at this time.

Marina Committee – Committee Chairman Bill Tanke stated that discussions have taken place with the Portage Port Authority. It appears that the Mayor does not wish to commit the city’s resources for the marina build-out at this time.
• Mr. Tanke is calling a marina committee meeting after the Board meeting tonight.
• Mr. Tanke referred to the 2 IDNR permit approvals for dredging that were included in the agenda packet.

Finance/Policy Committee – In Committee Chairman Curt Vosti’s absence, Arlene Colvin gave the Finance report. Ms. Colvin referred to the monthly financial statement.
• Ms. Colvin also referred to the COE letter requesting our local cash contribution of $266,000 that will meet our obligation toward construction through September 2003.
• Ms. Colvin made a motion to approve paying South Shore Marina an amount of $1313 (for cost incurred in barricading access to Commission property at Wright Street in Gary) out of the LEL funds; motion seconded by John Mroczkowski; motion passed unanimously.
Ms. Colvin then made a motion to approve paying South Shore Marina an amount of $1380 (for cost incurred in installing handrails at Burns Waterway Breakwater in Portage) out of Sand Fund monies; motion seconded by George Carlson; motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Colvin then made a motion to transfer funds in the amount of $3,000 from Line 5883 (Project Land Capital Improvements) to Line 5881 (Property/Structure Insurance). Actual property liability insurance was higher than anticipated and we still have 2 structure property insurance invoices we have not received yet; motion seconded by John Mroczkowski; motion passed unanimously. This transfer of funds should be adequate to cover all expenses in this budget line.

Ms. Colvin made a motion to approve the May claims for a total of $71,096.76; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Gardner added that staff has met and prioritized the remaining funds we have at the State Budget Agency to last through the 14 months remaining before the next budget session. With the $2.5 million being rescinded from the Commission, we need to spend the monies we have on priority items.

**Environmental Committee** – Committee Chairman Mark Reshkin gave the Environmental Report. He referred to a meeting that Mr. Gardner attended hosted by the Soil & Water Conservation Districts of IN/IL. Mr. Gardner gave the Little Cal video presentation, as well as talking about the watershed plan. Mark Reshkin inquired whether a bi-state coordination effort needs to be established and Mr. Gardner thought that it would be a good idea.

Imad Samara stated that the COE received a letter from Illinois (Don Vohemme) expressing some concern that the Indiana flood control project was not moving as quickly as the Illinois flood control project. They wish to meet with us at some point.

Mark Reshkin referred to the letter in the packet from the COE stating their request to make the property between Chase and Grant Streets available to them for the purpose of returning wetland hydrology to hydric soil in order to meet the IDEM 401 water quality certification requirements. Discussion ensued. Dr. Reshkin directed the attorney to do a legal analysis of the letter. After it is determined what our position should be, we will meet with LEL to explore options.

**Policy Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson referred to the draft bylaws that his committee has formulated. In discussing the travel for point of clarification, it was suggested that the bylaws be corrected to say that “staff includes contract employees”. No further comments were suggested. Mr. Carlson was commended on his efforts in putting the bylaws together. Dr. Reshkin made a motion to adopt the bylaws as presented with the one suggested change; motion seconded by Bob Marszalek; motion passed unanimously. Chairman Tanke directed the attorney to share the bylaws with the State Board of Accounts to make sure they are acceptable.

**Public Relations Committee** – Committee Chairman Bob Marszalek stated that he would be working with Judy Vamos to add some project information to the library web site.
Other Issues — Chairman Tanke scheduled a Commission special session for 5:00 June 28. Notice will be sent out.

Statements to the Board — Don Ewoldt questioned the contents of the letter received from the COE. He said that he would meet with the Commission at any time. He questioned Imad on the idea of separating the development and the maintenance of the in-project mitigation property. He felt strongly that by separating the contracts, it would increase the bids significantly. It would present problems by having 2 separate contractors.

- Judy Vamos informed the Board that she had visited areas in the east reach after the flooding and felt that the project was doing exactly what it is suppose to do; that is, hold the water in the flowage areas so surrounding area does not flood.

- Bill Petrites talked about the recent flood event. He felt that the current Highland drainage system is not adequate to handle drainage problems in that area. He also felt that INDOT should be working with Highland for a joint pump station that would help Highland correct their existing drainage problem. Mr. Gardner stated that we need to meet with John Bach to discuss this. Although Mr. Petrites thinks we would probably be wasting our time pursuing this with INDOT or the town, he suggested that we get involved in the permitting process. The only way he thinks we can help is to get involved in the permitting process. Because of his concern, Mr. Petrites has not given INDOT the easement they need from him for construction, but they can condemn him. Mr. Gardner stated that staff would request the plans & specifications from INDOT for this area in order that we and the COE office can review them.

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, July 3rd at 6:00 p.m.

/sjm
June 13, 2002

Planning Programs and Project Management Division

Jomary Crary
DNR, Division of Water
402 West Washington Street,
Room W264
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2641

Dear Mrs. Crary:

It was nice seeing you at Little Calumet River Development Commission Commissioners board meeting last Thursday June 6, 2002. At the meeting you requested the Burr Street Levee Maps. Enclosed in this letter are 2 sets of maps. Each set is mad up of three maps. These maps are the Pre-Project Flooding Limits, Current Flooding Limits, and Post Flooding Limits at the Burr Street Area. These maps also shows a tabulation of the elevations of the 100-Year flood Levels for each of these maps.

These maps reflect a slight correction to the maps provided at the May 2002 commissioners meeting. These maps will supersede the May 2002 maps.

If you have any questions regarding this item, please contact me at 312-353-5400 ext. 1809, or email me at imad.samara@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely Yours,

Imad N Samara
Project Manager

CF: Dan Gardner, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
After 30 years, Deep Tunnel in final phase

By Leo Marie Palmer
The Star

When it rains, calls pour into the office of state Sen. William Shaw, D-Delton.

The Little Calumet River almost is guaranteed to flood after a heavy rain, leaving Shaw's constituents from Harvey and Darien to Calumet City and Lansing complaining of water rising in their basements, flood damage and suffering property values.

"In South Holland, people have to rent boats when we have a heavy rain," said Shaw, who is also mayor of Dolton.

The solution -- an estimated $100 million endeavor conceived some 30 years ago -- got a little closer to completion on Thursday as the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District celebrated the start of the last leg of its Deep Tunnel with a groundbreaking ceremony at Veterans Park in Calumet City.

"It's appropriate that it's raining," MWWD President Terrence O'Brien said. "That's the whole purpose of this construction to save basements in this region from rains like this."

The 7.8-mile stretch of tunnel will serve a 14.2-square mile area that covers Dolton, South Holland, Calumet City, Lansing, Zion, Darien, Riverdale and Harvey.

Scheduled for completion in March 2005, the tunnel -- up to 200 feet underground in some spots -- will prevent 15 million gallons of polluted water from entering the Little Calumet River, meanwhile sparing from floods the 134,000 residents in its service area.

The entire system, 106 miles of tunnel with lines serving the Des Plaines and O'Hare areas, the city of Chicago and, now the South Suburbs, will provide 1.8 billion gallons of storage capacity, O'Brien said.

The tunnels won't be working alone, though.

The Calumet project, which includes 36.7 miles of tunnel, also includes a 4.6 billion-gallon reservoir to be completed at the Thornton Quarry. That won't happen for another 10 years, said Jack Farnan, general superintendent for the MWWD.

But, a transitional reservoir at the site takes in 1.4 billion gallons of stormwater just during rains in May and early June, Farnan said. Water collected in the tunnels and reservoir is stored until it can be pumped to existing treatment plants, purified and safely released to waterways.

"We know the system is working," he said. "In 14 years, we estimate we'll see $100 million in flood benefits. But this area, when it rains, is terrible."

Although the benefits are evident, the project's large, and expensive, scope at first was controversial, O'Brien said in a speech for the press and elected officials.

"Today, more than 85 percent of all consumers -- a little cleaner air was captured in the Deep Tunnel and the result is a great improvement in the water quality in the Chicago River," O'Brien said.

Fishing Classic held in Chicago two years ago The Chicago River is now considered a tourist attraction and a boost to real estate values.

Farnan said residents of the Calumet area won't dread the sound of raindrops on their roofs. They'll be happy to sit in their house watching the reservoir fill up, instead of their basements," he said.

Construction of the reservoirs and the tunnel system also has brought the MWWD praise from national engineering associations. The American Public Works Association named the project as one of the 16 Public Works Projects of the Century.

And it's been copied. The Channel, which connects England and France through an under-water tunnel, was based on the MWWD's design, said Gloria Majewski, MWWD finance chairman.

Variations on the project are underway in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, San Francisco, Detroit, Atlanta and Toronto, Farnan said. Farnan estimated that contractors would start drilling shafts for the tunnel in the next two months. Then, crews go underground, working there eight-hour shifts -- bathroom and lunch breaks included -- drilling rock to accommodate the 35-foot-diameter tunnel, Farnan said.

Fortunately, crews have to do very little dynamite blasting, making the work safer than it was, he added. He said 99 percent of the work is done with tunneling equipment.

"It's just like building a building," Farnan said. "It's just 500 feet underground."

Leo Marie Palmer may be reached at (708) 482-9915 or via e-mail at lpalmer@waternowpapers.com.
Approval

Continued from A1

The lone Northwest Indiana lawmaker, to vote against the measure was, Rep. Dan Dumezich, R-Schererville.

"I didn't think (the bill) contained enough economic stimulus for Lake County," he said, "and the average homeowner is going to a $300 reduction in property taxes, but a $300 increase in other taxes. The citizens of Lake County deserve better than that."" Democrats Gov. Frank O'Bannon promised to sign the bill, which was approved a day earlier by the Republican-led Senate, into law as quickly as possible.

The sweeping initiative was the result of a session-ending compromise between the administration and Senate GOP leaders, a fact that left many House Democrats feeling angry and betrayed.

But O'Bannon said, "This is the most monumental legislative package passed in more than 30 years."

"Most of the savings for homeowners will result from a move to shift 60 percent of school operating costs to the state and off local property tax rolls."

"In all, the measure raises about $1.75 billion over three years for the budget, which could be more than $1 billion in the red by mid-2003."

"I did not like the bill as it relates to long-term economic development," said Rep. Earl Harris, D-East Chicago. "But we have the problem of recession and the problem of industries in trouble, so I voted to try to deal with the here and now and not the future."

The region's other lawmakers, however, cited the potential gains for Northwest Indiana.

"It's not perfect, there's a lot of bad stuff in it, but considering the (economic) situation we're in, it gives Northwest Indiana a chance," said Rep. Ralph Ayres, R-Chesterton.

The bill also creates a profit-sharing plan for communities without casinos, which could provide Porter County with slightly more than $500,000 a year.

Rep. Linda Lawson, D-Hammond, said while she hoped lawmakers would do more to overhaul taxes and fix the budget, the bill heading to the governor's desk is at least a start.

Rep. Duane Cheney, D-Portage, agreed, saying the final legislative compromise might not go far enough, but it addresses some immediate fiscal problems in the region.

"It's the only way we're going to get revenues to stave off further cuts in education, Medicaid, prisons and parks," he said. "It's the best we could do under the circumstances."
Finally, a solution to fiscal crisis

The Issue: Indiana’s special session of the General Assembly
Our opinion: At the last minute, the legislature did what it had to do. It won’t be without pain, but it’s in our long-term best interest that this plan be put into place. Too bad this wasn’t done a long time ago.

The most important item on state lawmakers’ “to do” list can now safely have a check mark in front of it. Late Saturday, the special session of the Indiana General Assembly ended with approval of a bill to shore up Indiana’s finances and restructure taxes.

This is one of those landmark moments in Indiana history that will be remembered for decades.

House Bill 1001, which received bipartisan support in both the House and Senate, brings sweeping changes that will affect everyone in Indiana, from homeowners to tenants to business owners.

The result will help Indiana avoid the deficit of more than $1 billion that had been projected by mid-2003.

Taxpayers will find much to praise and much to curse in this bill, which is expected to be signed into law soon by Democratic Gov. Frank O’Bannon.

Some of the provisions will soften the blow of the reassessment that was expected to result in huge property tax bills for many Hoosiers.

The legislation increases the homeowner’s exemption from $6,000 to $35,000. The homestead credit, now at 10 percent, increases to 20 percent. It was to have decreased to 4 percent beginning in 2003.

It also shifts 60 percent of the burden for schools from the local property taxes onto the state. Considering that schools account for about two-thirds of the total property taxes each homeowner pays, that in itself will be a big relief.

Rep. Dan Dumezich, R-Schererville, was the only Northwest Indiana lawmaker to vote against the compromise legislation. He, along with Rep. Earl Harris, D-East Chicago, said the bill didn’t contain enough long-term economic stimulus for Lake County.

But just look at what the bill does for businesses. It eliminates the corporate gross income and supplemental net income taxes and phases out the inventory tax over five years. The research and development tax credit doubles to 10 percent.

These are policies that aim to improve the climate for business in Indiana. Given the region’s strategic location, these new tax policies should make promoting Northwest Indiana much easier.

And legalization of dockside gambling should provide an immediate boost to the casino industry and, as a result, to local governments.

A profit-sharing plan for communities without casinos could give Porter County more than $900,000 a year.

But there are costs, too.

The sales tax will be 6 percent, up from the current 5 percent. The gas tax will rise by 3 cents per gallon. The cigarette tax will go up 40 cents per pack.

Well, no one said this would be painless. The question was really more a matter of where to distribute that pain in the long-term best interest of the state.

Rep. Ralph Ayres, R-Chesterton, summed it up well. “It’s not perfect, there’s a lot of bad stuff in it, but considering the (economic) situation we’re in, it gives Northwest Indiana a chance,” he said.

It is a shame that it took so long to get this legislation passed. It is all the more ironic when comparing how similar the final outcome is to the original proposals to restructure taxes and shore up the state’s finances.

This should have been done in the regular session so the taxpayers wouldn’t have to pay for the overtime special session that ended Saturday.

But at least this crisis finally has been solved. Now we can move forward to the next problem.
INDIANAPOLIS

Schultz named budget director

Former Democratic state lawmaker aware of 'tough assignment.'

BY TERRY BURNS
Times Statehouse Bureau Chief

Gov. Frank O'Bannon has named Marilyn Schultz, a former Democratic state lawmaker and university administrator, to be the state's new budget director.

Schultz, who lives in Indianapolis, replaces State Budget Director Betty Cockrum, who recently accepted a job as president and chief executive officer for Planned Parenthood of Greater Indiana.

Schultz takes over the budget agency at a time when Indiana is facing its worst budget crisis in decades and poised to enact a series of tax increases aimed at balancing the state's bottom line and overhauling the tax system.

The former state representative will be one of the key administration officials responsible for implementing those sweeping budget and tax reforms, which recently were approved by the General Assembly.

"I am thrilled that Marilyn Schultz has agreed to take on this tough assignment," O'Bannon said Tuesday in announcing the appointment.

"I've known her for many years, and I have always been impressed by her understanding of the nuances of the state's fiscal picture."

Schultz, currently director of the Division of Disability, Aging and Rehabilitation Services in the Family and Social Services Administration, may be the first budget director who also served in the General Assembly.

She was a member of the House from 1972 to 1986, serving on the Ways and Means Committee, as an alternate to the State Budget Committee, and chairwoman of the School Finance Subcommittee.

After leaving the legislature, she served as director of administration for the Indiana University School of Medicine, later became associate vice president at Indiana State University and eventually was named ISU's vice president for planning and budgets.
**CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECKING ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>14,521.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>171,753.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX FUND</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENTS</td>
<td>1,530,399.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
<td>100.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,716,775.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - MAY 31, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIPTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEASE RENTS</td>
<td>23,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME (FROM CHECKING &amp; FIRST NATL)</td>
<td>14,656.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>346,478.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
<td>256.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. INCOME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRBC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE</td>
<td>520.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECEIPTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>386,712.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - MAY 31, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 EXPENSES PAID IN 2002</td>
<td>94,996.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DIEM</td>
<td>3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>4,058.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPC</td>
<td>59,680.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; MILEAGE</td>
<td>689.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; ADVERTISING</td>
<td>539.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDS &amp; INSURANCE</td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
<td>2,747.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING EXPENSE</td>
<td>1,650.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>35,911.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICES</td>
<td>21,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES</td>
<td>35,803.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL</td>
<td>17,597.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES</td>
<td>8,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS SERVICES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>91,833.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES</td>
<td>6,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC/ MARKETING SOURCES</td>
<td>380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; STRUCTURE COSTS</td>
<td>7,559.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING ALLOCATION</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
<td>6,521.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; STRUCTURE INSURANCE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES</td>
<td>65,905.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK CHARGES MERCANTILE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>377,427.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASH POSITION - MAY 31, 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHECKING ACCOUNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
<td>102,189.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>93,111.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONAL BANK</td>
<td>700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE CAPITAL INVESTMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONAL BANK</td>
<td>258,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC INTERESTERAL INVESTMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>130,347.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(REAL MONEY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>141,684.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MARINA SAND MONEY)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>17,713.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(STATE DRAIN MONIES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
<td>389,438.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY PARKS &amp; REC MONIES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,637,182.31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST AVAILABLE</th>
<th>356.70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,832,840.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
### MONTHLY BUDGET REPORT, JUNE 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE TOTAL</th>
<th>ALLOCATED</th>
<th>BALANCE</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><strong>4,150.00</strong></td>
<td>11,850.00</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><strong>1,295.83</strong></td>
<td>2,253.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC 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><strong>10,175.62</strong></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><strong>355.88</strong></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><strong>522.29</strong></td>
<td>4,477.71</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>5,993.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>6,070.75</strong></td>
<td>1,429.25</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><strong>304.23</strong></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><strong>832.29</strong></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><strong>4,287.43</strong></td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL 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><strong>46,326.16</strong></td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 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><strong>0.00</strong></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><strong>0.00</strong></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><strong>760.54</strong></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>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></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>162.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td>24,949.25</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

### 12 MONTH UNALLOCATED BUDGETED

<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>16,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>4,150.00</strong></td>
<td>11,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>6,246.48</strong></td>
<td>2,253.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5812 NRPC SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>60,295.74</strong></td>
<td>64,704.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>730.60</strong></td>
<td>13,269.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>522.29</strong></td>
<td>4,477.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>6,070.75</strong></td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>570.75</strong></td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>1,005.20</strong></td>
<td>6,994.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>38,119.47</strong></td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>207,222.64</strong></td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</td>
<td>3,170,188.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>26,280.09</strong></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>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>26,178.50</strong></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>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>63,267.54</strong></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>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>247,000.00</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td><strong>25,000.00</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 4,486,188.00 | 442,727.87 | 4,043,460.13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>CURT VOSTI</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>JOHN MROCZKOWSKI</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>GEORGE CARLSON</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>BILL TANKE</td>
<td>600.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>BOB HUFFMAN</td>
<td>650.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>ARLENE COLVIN</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>EMERSON DELANEY</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>BOB MARSZEK</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5901</td>
<td>MARION WILLIAMS</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5911</td>
<td>CASALE WOODWARD BULS, LLP</td>
<td>283.33</td>
<td>RETAINER FEE BILLED FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/24/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5911</td>
<td>CASALE WOODWARD BULS, LLP</td>
<td>1,012.50</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL LEGAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/24/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5912</td>
<td>NRPC</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
<td>SERVICES PERFORMED MAY 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>MARION WILLIAMS</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>BOB MARSZEK</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>EMERSON DELANEY</td>
<td>24.35</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>ARLENE COLVIN</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>BOB HUFFMAN</td>
<td>111.44</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>BILL TANKE</td>
<td>102.48</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>MILEAGE 6/1/02-6/19/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5921</td>
<td>JIM POKRAJAC</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>EXPENSES INCURRED AT MEETING IN CHICAGO COE OFFICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W/ JAN PLACHTA TO DISCUSS UTILITY COORDINATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5924</td>
<td>AT &amp; T</td>
<td>188.83</td>
<td>BILLING PERIOD 5/15/02-6/10/02 (TOTAL BILL 204.53 KRBG 15.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5924</td>
<td>VERIZON</td>
<td>115.60</td>
<td>BILLING PERIOD 6/16/02-7/16/02 (TOTAL BILL 228.99 KRBG 119.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5925</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>205.00</td>
<td>EXPENSES INCURRED FOR 6/1/02 BEAUTIFICATION OF THE LEVEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5925</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>95.73</td>
<td>EXPENSES INCURRED 9/6/02 SSD MEETING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5925</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>527.98</td>
<td>SPECIAL RETREAT MEETING 9/28/02 TO DISCUSS LCRBDC ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5928</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>4,287.43</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/LEGAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/24/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5941</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL WORK FOR DC-216B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5941</td>
<td>JANET O'TOOLE &amp; ASSOCIATES</td>
<td>4,350.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL WORK FOR DC-216E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5942</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>2,846.08</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/14/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>LAKE COUNTY RECORDER</td>
<td>103.00</td>
<td>TO RECORD EASEMENT DEEDS FOR DC-1027, DC-1028, DC-1035, DC-1036-1040 &amp; DC-1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465(LOTS 1-15, &amp; 28-40, BLK 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465(LOTS 1-15, &amp; 28-40, BLK 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465 (LOTS 1 &amp; 2 BLK 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465 (LOT 11, BLK 1 &amp; LOTS 18-20 BLK2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465 (LOTS 1, 4, 5, 10 &amp; 11 BLK 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465 (LOTS 26-28 BLK 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-465 (LOTS 24-27 BLK 4 GEORGIA GARDENS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-113B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-111B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR MITIGATION M-02 7 ACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR MITIGATION M-03 33 ACRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR M-01 MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR M-02 MITIGATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>TICOR TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5943</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK FOR DC-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>4,922.75</td>
<td>ENGINEERING/LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 5/16/02-5/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>178.48</td>
<td>MAY MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>3,654.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING/LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 6/1/02-6/14/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>4,466.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING/LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 6/16/02-6/30/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>141.12</td>
<td>JUNE MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>3,412.75</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 5/15/02-5/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>MAY MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>2,883.50</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 6/1/02-6/14/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>2,883.50</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 6/16/02-6/30/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5944</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>JUNE MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT</td>
<td>VENDOR NAME</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>912.50</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN/LAND ACQUISITION ASST 5/16/02-5/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>374.13</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN/LAND ACQUISITION ASST 6/4/02-6/8/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>793.88</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN/LAND ACQUISITION ASST 6/16/02-6/30/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>404.25</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 5/16/02-5/31/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>220.50</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 6/3/02-6/13/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5844</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 6/15/02-6/30/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5847</td>
<td>DLZ</td>
<td>610.00</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/15/02 STAGE VI-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5862</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>789.54</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 6/14/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 68,087.98
Planning, Programs and
Project Management Division

Patty Rench,
Bank One, Indiana, NA
1801 Kennedy Avenue
Schererville, IN 46375

SUBJECT: Little Calumet River Project Construction Fund Escrow Account Number 7500-0244-4747

Dear Ms. Rench:

The Department of the Army hereby issues a written request for withdrawal of $100,000 from the referenced escrow account in accordance with the escrow agreement entered into on August 19, 1990.

Please provide the amount requested above in the form of a bank draft, payable to "FAO, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District." Please mail or otherwise deliver to this address to the attention of Mrs. Sherry Barham, CELRC-PP-PO, within 10 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager

Copies Furnished:

Mr. Dan Gardner
Executive Director
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
7-9-02

Bill Tanke, Chairman
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
6100 Southport Rd.
Portage, IN 46368

Dear Mr. Tanke,

I appreciate that there are reasons why Commission has in the past not chosen to look into Trust for Public Land, a national non-profit with a Chicago office who normally buys land for government projects.

However, in this down time of no funding from the state, wouldn’t it be appropriate to seriously look into this option to get that Hobart Marsh land acquired and settle the issue of whether the mitigation land will disappear or not once and for all? This would help greatly in getting the DNR and IDEM permits.

From what I understand, Trust for Public Land operates without a contract by buying land at appraised value from the landowners and then sells it to the government agency again at appraised value (appraisers mutually agreed upon). That sounds like no more obligation to the commission than the current lease-option plan of paying for a fourth or so of a landowners’ property each year.

Trust for Public Land has expressed willingness to help this project in the past. It seems logical to take advantage of an ally so as not to lose any more properties and see the prices go up further. Currently, Hobart Marsh has one key 30 acre and two 15 acre properties for sale by realtors. The real estate boom continues in the economy, so prices are possibly double what they were two years ago.

As a member of the public, I would like a report on how Trust for Public Land could be used to acquire land in Hobart Marsh at the next Little Calumet River Basin Development Basin board meeting.

Sincerely,

Sandy O'Brien
5500 S. Liverpool Rd.
Hobart, IN 46342

Cc John Goss, DNR Director
Marty Maupin, IDEM
Congressman Peter Visclosky
May 31, 2002

Planning Programs and Project Management Division

Mr. Donald R. Vonnahme, Director
Office of Water Resources,
Illinois Department of Natural Resources
524 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62701-1787

Dear Director Vonnahme:

Thank you for your letter of March 19, 2002 in which you detail the concerns of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and the Metropolitan Water Resources District of Greater Chicago (MWRDGC) regarding the functional relationship between the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project being constructed by the Corps of Engineers in Indiana and the interim Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Thornton Quarry Reservoir. As you are aware, the planning and coordination on these two projects has been ongoing for a number of years. The Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project was authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986; however bi-state and interagency coordination was ongoing long before the project authorization.

The first comprehensive meeting on the Little Calumet River project between concerned parties took place on November 22, 1985. Attendees at that meeting included representatives of the INDOT Office of Water Resources, the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, the NRCS (formerly titled the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, or SCS), the Corps of Engineers and our Local Sponsor for the Project, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (LCRBDC). It is important to note that at that meeting all parties accepted the differences in without project discharges. Further, the with-project (Indiana Levee Project and NRCS Reservoir) stages predicted at the state line were accepted as in reasonable agreement by all parties. The memorandum of record for that meeting also contains a discussion regarding concerns about the potential impacts of the Indiana project in Illinois. The consensus reached by attendees included restrictions that the Indiana project must be designed to demonstrate that for with-project conditions, there would not be a flow increase across the state line to cause a stage increase greater than 0.1 feet. It should also be noted that the analysis by the NRCS recognized that additional flow would be pulled into
In 1994, the Chicago District completed a more comprehensive study of the Illinois-Indiana watershed. The study included an analysis of the Illinois-Cumberland River basin and the surrounding areas. The results of this study were used to develop a new model to predict water surface elevation and discharge for the Illinois-Indiana watershed. The model was validated with data from the Illinois-Indiana watershed and was found to be accurate.

The model was developed using data from the Illinois-Indiana watershed and was validated with data from the Illinois-Cumberland River basin. The results of the model were compared to observed data and were found to be within 10% of the observed values. The model was also tested for different flow conditions and was found to be accurate for all conditions.

The model was used to predict water surface elevation and discharge for the Illinois-Indiana watershed for the years 1985 to 1995. The results were compared to observed data and were found to be within 10% of the observed values. The model was also tested for different flow conditions and was found to be accurate for all conditions.

The model was used to predict water surface elevation and discharge for the Illinois-Indiana watershed for the year 2000. The results were compared to observed data and were found to be within 10% of the observed values. The model was also tested for different flow conditions and was found to be accurate for all conditions.
Table 2 - 100 Year Event Stage, Flow and Volume Comparisons at the Illinois-Indiana Stateline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Thornton Reservoir</th>
<th>With Thornton Reservoir</th>
<th>Change (with Thornton without Thornton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow (cfs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage (feet NGVD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>598.5</td>
<td>596.3</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>598.2</td>
<td>595.5</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (acre-feet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>12,406</td>
<td>13,414</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>12,199</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on FDM 5, Appendix A, Tables A-13 & A-14 (1994)

In early 2002 as part of a Chicago Underflow Plan (CUP) study effort, the data for the operation of Thorn Creek was examined using historic records and discharge relationships developed during the Little Calumet River detailed hydraulic studies (FDM 5). The purpose of this review was to identify an adjustment factor for the South Holland gage record that could represent the historic record adjusted for the operation of the Thorn Creek Reservoir. As part of these studies, the overall "total" historic record volume increase across the Illinois-Indiana stateline was estimated by two different techniques for several intermediate combinations of projects. From this analysis, it was concluded that the overall difference in the long term volume of flow crossing the stateline once both projects are fully constructed compared to a condition with neither project being constructed is minimal.

In respect to the amount of flow volume that could be pulled from the Little Calumet River, it is possible that the volume that would be pulled into the Thornton Reservoir could be controlled by various gate settings at the inflow structure. Early NRCS and all Corps of Engineers evaluation have considered only the Thorn Creek watershed as the inflow source to the Thornton Reservoir based on the historic record at the Thorn Creek at Thornton USGS gage. Further, these evaluations considered a simple fixed bypass flow around the Thorn Creek control structure. Recently, it is believed that Conser, Townsend, Envirodyne (CTE), a consultant for MWRDGC on the Thornton Reservoir project has developed two-dimensional and three-dimensional flow models of this confluence area and has noted the possibility of using the Thorn Creek Reservoir control gates to pull additional flow from the Little Calumet River,
dependent on local flood conditions. Follow up meetings to discuss the issues raised in this correspondence, should therefore, include representatives from CTE.

Given the studies conducted by the Corps of Engineers in 1994 as part of the flood control project evaluations, including the evaluation of the flow control structure, it is likely that any future evaluations associated with the operation of the Thornton Reservoir will show that any increase in flow volume into the reservoir would be due to the operation of the Thornton Reservoir and not due to the levee construction in Indiana. The evaluations discussed in the previous paragraphs considered a fully constructed Indiana project, including construction of the flow control structure.

As you may or may not be aware, at the present time the State of Indiana is faced with a funding shortage. The schedule for installing the control structure on the Little Calumet River has been pushed to fiscal year 2006. We are working with our local sponsor to keep the schedule changes to a minimal. The congressional support for this project is still high. Congressman Visclosky and his staff are working very hard with the Indiana State Government to try to bring the Little Calumet River Project back on schedule. Soon our office will set up a meeting that will include your office, the LCRBD, the MWRDGC, and CTE to discuss the issues raised in this correspondence. Imad Samara the Little Calumet River Project Manager and Scott Vowinkel the Chicagoland Underflow Plan Project Manager will work together to coordinate this meeting. Mr. Samara can be reached at 312-353-6400 extension 1809. Mr. Vowinkel's number is 312-353-6400 extension.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Raymond Coughenour
Deputy for Project Management

Enclosure
CF: Dan Gardner, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
    John C Farnan, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago
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.

V.E. COST SAVINGS ITEMS

A. An Engineering Committee meeting was held on November 13, 2001, to review a tentative list of cost savings issues for our project.
   1. These included reviews of our rights and entitlements of our 75' drainage easement, re-channeling of the river to lessen impacts to property owners, hydrology changes near the state line due to Cady Marsh modifications and the Thornton Quarry, and re-consideration of our approach to Woodmar County Club.
   - LCRBDC sent a letter to the Hammond City Planner on February 25 along with a copy of all current real estate plans for the West Reach (in Hammond) asking them to incorporate this into their community comprehensive plan. (As of May 29th we have not received a written response)

2. We had a meeting with the Lake County Surveyors Office on April 11th to discuss and review the 75' drainage easement.
   - We received a phone call on May 6th from the Lake County Surveyor’s Office (including John Dull, County attorney) stating that the County no longer recognizes this as a legal drain.
   - Attorney Casale submitted a letter to the County on May 9th requesting Attorney Dull authorize the Surveyor’s Office to proceed.
   - We received letters of response from Attorney Dull on May 13th and May 22nd re-stating their position in writing.
B. The V.E. issues, and their status, are as follows:

V.E. #1 – Stage VI Issues

1. Minimizing levee footprint
   - The COE modified the real estate impacts for Krosan and the (3) hotels, legals were completed, and the appraiser is working on these properties.
   - LCRBDC & COE to meet to discuss remaining Kennedy Industrial Park properties for cost savings modifications.

2. KROSAN property
   - Entitlements to rights on the 75’ drainage easement are currently being determined by the LCRBDC attorney.
   - Refer to Page 1 for the current status of getting the County to establish the location of the 75’ easement line relative to property lines and structures (Item A-2).(Ongoing)

C. V.E. #2 – Stage VIII Issues

1. (4) Homes west of Hohman Avenue
   - Survey has been completed showing that only the furthest house east could be impacted by floodwaters during a 100 year event. (Refer to Land Acquisition Report)
   - LCRBDC to coordinate with Munster regarding public safety & emergency response issues. (Ongoing)

2. Southmoor Estates levee
   - COE to check geotech issues regarding slope stability and water tightness of existing embankment. (Ongoing)
   - COE to investigate alternative construction methods to minimize impact to residents during installation (possibly working from river side) (Ongoing)

3. Type of Protection
   - COE will pursue alternatives to levee alignment and design through in-house staff and SEH. (Ongoing)

D. V.E. #3 – Woodmar Country Club

1. Length of construction time
   - The COE feels all construction could be completed in one season, and the LCRBDC concurs.
   - After construction impact is evaluated by the COE, the appraisal will need to be redone. (Ongoing)
OUTSTANDING PROJECT ISSUES:

A. Responses to (5) Outstanding GSD Concerns
   1. We received the COE response on February 7, 2002.
   2. A meeting was held on June 6, 2002 at the LCRBDC office with the city
      of Gary, GSD, WREP, Greeley & Hansen (GSD engineering consultant), and
      LCRBDC.
         • Minutes of the meeting were completed and distributed to all
           attendees on June 24, 2002.

B. Utility Relocation Coordination
   1. A utility coordination meeting was held with the Coe on June 12 to
      review interaction with the utilities, current funding and scheduling, and
      tracking.
         • Preliminary minutes of the meeting were distributed for
           comments, corrections, additions, etc. on June 26th.
   2. Jim Pokrajac met with the COE in Chicago on June 25 to discuss
      upcoming project segments, how to obtain utility information,
      compensability tracking, and the LCRBDC money situation.
         • A sample letter was completed that can be used to obtain
           information from utilities.
         • LCRBDC will be pursuing a meeting with the city of Gary to see if
           they can participate in some of the costs for Betterment Levee II.
           (Ongoing)

C. V-2 Pipeline Elevations and Locations (On Hold due to financial priorities)
   1. Additional engineering information will be needed by the COE to
      complete their design. This will be done at a later date due to funding
      shortages.

D. Engineering Review of Plans and Specifications
   1. Refer to letter dated February 28, 2002 for details.
   2. All remaining engineering for this project has either been completed or is
      at least at the 50% level of review.
         • Some issues still need to be resolved as part of the final review
           process.
PROJECT CONCERNS (ONGOING)

A. Creditable Costs versus Project Cost
1. When the LCRBDC coordinates, and pays for, engineering or utility tasks, we pay 100% of the cost and get fully credited. If the COE, or their A/E perform the same task, it would be a project cost whereby the LCRBDC would only participate in 25% of the cost (18% credits and 7% cash).

B. Scheduling
1. We are in agreement that the LCA states the funding requirements regarding the non-Federal spending should match the Federal spending. Unfortunately, the IN State Budget did not provide adequate funds to do this, and continue to do so.
2. Stage VII and Stage VIII are way in advance. To again refer to our budgetary constraints, which the COE is aware of, we have agreed, and the COE agreed with us, that we would only complete real estate and utility coordination in the next upcoming construction segment. As each segment was completed, we would then move to the next segment west.
3. As this project moves westward, all of these previously engineered segments will need to be re-visited to confirm changes in existing real estate impacts and confirm that utilities (and how to re-locate these utilities) have not changed.
# OUTSTANDING PROJECT ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Issue Raised By</th>
<th>Most Recent Status</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
<th>Next Action By</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SCHEDULING</td>
<td>Project Schedule should coordinate with Local Funding. Schedule should allow for Real Estate, Relocation, and local reviews. Design is done too far in advance of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to meet and discuss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION COORDINATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Compensability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Guidelines</td>
<td>Currently there is not agreement at all levels of the Corps on what constitutes a compensable interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps need to provide clear legally defensible guidelines on what constitutes a compensable interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Determinations</td>
<td>Determination of compensability needs to be made before the relocation process so that we can inform the utility regarding whether they must pay for relocation. It also assures the LCRBDC getting credit for the relocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Corps needs to make compensability determinations as soon as possible for those projects where the schedule dictates utility relocation is being pursued.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Early Notification and Request for Information</td>
<td>Need a means of notifying utility of the project and schedule and the need to relocate along with a request for easements, deeds, permits, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCRBDC developing letter with Corps approval to send to all identified utilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Schedule</td>
<td>Need to develop a reasonable schedule so that utility relocation can proceed in a timely fashion. Should not pursue relocation until it can be funded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a schedule for utility relocation which reflects construction sequence and available funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION EFFORTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Stage VII and VIII</td>
<td>Currently design of these Stages is moving forward including utility relocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage VII and VIII utility relocation efforts by the Corps' AVE's needs to be redefined. Only identification of utility relocations is needed along with information needed for design of levee at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Outstanding Issues</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Most Recent Status</td>
<td>Action Needed</td>
<td>Next Action By</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Phillips Pipeline Stage V-1</td>
<td>Corps has never provided approval (for creditability) of the cost for engineering work needed to provide the Corps with the data they requested to approve of a directional bore pipeline relocation. LCRBDC is recommending the safer directional bore over the &quot;up and over&quot; original proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corps needs to supply their requirements for directional bore crossings so that Phillips may resubmit a cost proposal for a design conforming to the COE's requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CREDITING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Backlog</td>
<td>Local sponsor needs to eliminate backlog of submittal on crediting to COE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LCRBDC will work to reduce the backlog.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Federal Highway</td>
<td>LCRBDC to be credited the Federal (FHA) funds used on Highway Improvement Projects identified under the Little Calumet River Flood Control Projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Awaiting LCRBDC response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>BURR STREET BETTERMENT LEVEE</td>
<td>Phase 1 is complete, need to build Phase 2. Project is considered a betterment. Credits for project approved flood proofing have been used in Phase 1. Since project is a betterment and credits have been used, the cost to build Phase 2 is 100% local and not creditable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LCRBDC is pursuing relief from ban on using state funding for non-creditable costs. Corps is reviewing flood proofing design and costs to determine whether any additional credits can be found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>COST SHARING</td>
<td>Cost share is 75% Federal and 25%. End of FY 01 Expenditure Federal $76,700 Local (credited) $14,400. Local at 14%.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Increase Local cash contribution or expedite acquisition of west reach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ENGINEERING REVIEW OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS</td>
<td>Incomplete sets of plans and specifications. Concerns brought up don't get resolved. Unresolved concerns end up adding additional cost to the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Agreed to work together to eliminate problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>REMAINING EAST REACH RECREATION FEATURES</td>
<td>Schedule for the remaining recreation feature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>INDOT PROJECT AT INDPLS. BLVD. IN TRI-STATE AREA</td>
<td>Information needed to support a pump station in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not an issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, BUSINESS PROCESS TRACKING PLAN

#### OUTSTANDING PROJECT ISSUES (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Issue Raised By</th>
<th>Most Recent Status</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CREDITABLE COST VS. PROJECT COST</td>
<td>LCRBDC performs tasks that are classified as creditable when the tasks should be performed by the Corps or its A/E and be a project cost. (Exempler: Survey Work and Utility Coordination)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>LCRBDC</td>
<td>Funding spending will be in accordance with the LGA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>GARY SANITARY DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Telemetry System</td>
<td>GSD has requested radio telemetry be installed at the Gary pump stations Federal regs. Require the stations to be manned when operating during flood event. It was noted that stations are remote and the emergency signal lights are not a practical means of alerting GSD to problems.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>GSD needs to provide letter making the case for use of technology (vs. manpower) and what is or will be standard throughout their system. Corps is to revisit their previous decision to not fund telemetry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Permitted Outfalls and Project Impact</td>
<td>GSD has heard that the increased level of the Little Calumet River due to the project could be anywhere from 1-2&quot; to 6-12&quot;. GSD's concern is the impact of the higher level of the river on the outfalls at Broadway, Louisiana and Ches Streets.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>COE to review XP-SWMM model. Further meeting needed to discuss findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Ironwood Storm Water Pumping Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Access Issues</td>
<td>Ability to access site during flood events for emergency repairs with equipment has been questioned.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>GSD</td>
<td>COE to take another look at situation. Field meeting would be helpful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Most Recent Status</td>
<td>Action Needed</td>
<td>Next Action By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GSD concern about flood level and its impact on the combined sewers in the area of Ironwood Circle. Again concern from GSD is whether increase in flood level is 1-2” or 6 to 12”. Imad Samara’s letter of 2-7-02 shows impact of 0.8’ (10”) for the 100-year event at Martin Luther King Drive. Higher levels may result in increased basement flooding.</td>
<td>X COE LCRBDC GSD</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>COE needs to review increased levels of flooding and whether something needs to be done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GSD has requested correspondence to and from USEPA and IDEM regarding projects in Gary. GSD concerned about impact on combined sewer overflows.</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>Corps currently working with Earth Tech to complete new XP-SWMM modeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GSD has requested copies of inspection reports documenting soil and erosion control measures were practiced by contractors during levee construction.</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>Meeting on June 6 COE</td>
<td>COE to make the necessary data and documentation available. COE also to check on all quality assurance and quality control measures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GSD wants opportunity to review manual before it is finalized.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>Final draft of manual will be available by the end of September 2002. GSD and other Gary agencies and the LCRBDC will receive copies of final draft for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GSD determined that the culvert through the I-wall on the east side of Chase Street is about 2’ higher than the ditch invert. GSD indicates that this is a problem because their pump station combined sewer overflow utilizes the ditch.</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>X GSD</td>
<td>COE to investigate and propose a solution to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Outstanding Issues</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Issue Raised By</td>
<td>Most Recent Status</td>
<td>Action Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>TECHNICAL REVIEW MEETINGS</td>
<td>Since much of design has been completed, technical review meetings need to be held only on an as needed basis.</td>
<td>LCRBDC COE LCRBDC COE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule meetings as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SHEET PILING ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Damage to Adjacent Property</td>
<td>Potential damage to adjacent property during construction.</td>
<td>LCRBDC X LCRBDC X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps to incorporate property and structural inspection and other contractor requirements into contract documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Useful Life of Steel Sheet Piles</td>
<td>Concern about useful life of piles as a result of corrosion.</td>
<td>LCRBDC X LCRBDC X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>OVERFLOW SECTIONS</td>
<td>LCRBDC believed overflow section should be armored, since they are at risk of failure during an overflow event without it.</td>
<td>LCRBDC X LCRBDC X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps did not agree. After lengthy discussion, LCRBDC and the Corps agreed to disagree. As a result overflows will remain unarmored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Value Engineering Cost Saving Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Issue Raised By LCRBDC</th>
<th>Most Recent Status LCRBDC</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
<th>Next Action By</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>STAGE VI ISSUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Highland Dump</td>
<td>LCRBDC had proposed modifying location of levee to maintain channel width by filling in channel to minimize real estate requirements in the Kennedy Industrial Park area.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved – both COE and LCRBDC agreed not to impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Channel Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Resolved – LCRBDC agreed not to pursue due to water depth and steepness of slope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Minimizing Levee Footprint</td>
<td>Eliminating or modifying planting zone and using retaining walls was proposed to minimize levee footprint in the Kennedy Industrial Park.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps needs to complete analysis for the remainder of Kennedy Industrial Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Kroan Property</td>
<td>75' drainage easement impacts this developed area.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCRBDC currently coordinating with the county to establish this line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>STAGE VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Homes west of Homan Avenue</td>
<td>Recent modeling showed 3 of the 4 homes to be out of the 100 year flood elevation. This along with the property owners desire to be left alone raised the issue whether they could be removed from project.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps needs to provide definitive letter that homes are out of floodplain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Southmoor Estates Levee Slope Stability</td>
<td>LCRBDC proposed installing a low earth berm to minimize impacts. Corps indicated this was not technically feasible due to slope stability problems.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Meeting on</td>
<td>Corps to check on slope stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Minimize Impacts Including Loss of Trees</td>
<td>The proposed Stage VII plans show the entire rear yards to be in the work area. This is not desirable since many large trees will be lost.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corps to investigate alternate construction methods and alternate levee alignment and design. (Maybe working from right side.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Value Engineering Cost Saving Issues (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Outstanding Issues</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
<th>Issue Raised By</th>
<th>Most Recent Status</th>
<th>Action Needed</th>
<th>Next Action By</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>WOODMAR COUNTRY CLUB</strong></td>
<td><strong>a. Tie Back Levee</strong> Levee construction across golf course was initially viewed as disrupting 2 playing seasons. These proposals were made to minimize the cost of the real estate taking.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved – LCRBDC concurs with COE that tie back levees not economically feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>b. Length of Construction Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved – Corps and LCRBDC agree to complete all construction in one season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>BORROW SITES</strong></td>
<td><strong>a. Doughman Borrow Site</strong> LCRBDC proposed that the Corps continue to allow contracts to provide their own clay for the remainder of the east reach and easterly portions of the west reach. The Doughman Borrow Pit is a source for contractors to obtain clay. Development of a Clark-Chase borrow site has turned out to be impractical.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved – COE will continue to allow contracts to provide own clay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>b. Hartsdale Pond</strong></td>
<td>LCRBDC has proposed use of the Hartsdale Pond site for a borrow site for some west reach project.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolved – LCRBDC to obtain interlocal agreement with Lake County Drainage Board for use as borrow site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Otho Lyles, Carmen Wilson, Jim Meyer, Don Smales, Ray Coughenour, Imad Samara, Sue Davis, Jim Flora, Dan Gardner

FROM: Jim Pokrajac, Agent, Land Management/Engineering, LCRBDC

SUBJECT: Minutes of the June 6th GSD Coordination meeting

DATE: June 24, 2002

Enclosed are minutes from our GSD coordination meeting on June 6th to discuss seven outstanding issues that have remained between the ACOE, the LCRBDC, the city of Gary, and the GSD. These minutes reflect the discussion that was held for each of these items and was based upon input from representatives of each involved party.

It is our intent that these items still remain to be resolved and that I will be the point of contact to help facilitate any of these actions. If you have any questions or would like to discuss any future meetings/conferece calls, please call me at the above number.

/sjm

encl.

cc: Roy Deda, ACOE
Arlene Colvin, LCRBDC
Bob Huffman, LCRBDC
GARY SANITARY DISTRICT
MINUTES OF THE JUNE 6, 2002 MEETING
12:00 NOON, LCRBDC OFFICE

Attendees: Otho Lyles, Board President, Gary Sanitary District
Carmen W. Wilson, Director, Gary Sanitary District
Jim Meyer, Attorney, Gary Sanitary District
Lee Cunningham, Engineering Intern, Gary Sanitary District
Don Smales, Greeley & Hansen
Ray Coughenour, Deputy District Director, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Imad Samara, Project Manager, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Sue Davis, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (by telephone)
Dan Gardner, Executive Director, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, Land Management/Engineering Agent, LCRBDC

Following are the minutes of the June 6th coordination meeting with the Gary Sanitary District regarding the remaining 7 issues. The minutes are as follows:

1. Telemetry Request
   - GSD would still like to have improved communications with each of the 4 new stations we built in Gary.
   - Dan Gardner concurred saying that all 4 stations are in remote locations
   - Ray Coughenour asked Imad Samara what the COE expectations were regarding having a competent operator visiting each station.
   - Imad pointed out the COE have written a letter dated August 12, 1999 explaining the COE position regarding the issue.
     - The COE requested (Ray suggested) that the GSD would like a letter stating what their normal operations would require.
   - Don Smales pointed out that the GSD currently has telemetry systems (antennas, etc.) at the existing CSO sites.
   - WREP will submit a letter to the COE giving their current costs estimates to provide telemetry for the 4 stations.
   - Jim Flora asked whether this telemetry should be incorporated as part of our project because all of the other stations in Gary currently have, or will have, this type of system. GSD needs to make case for use of technology (vs. manpower) and what is/or will be standard throughout their system.
   - Ray Coughenour agreed that he would discuss this with Imad Samara and Sue Davis to see if they could incorporate this into their project.
   - Imad did mention to Ray that COE guidance prevents us from adding telemetry and Imad stated that the project is providing a flood warning system.

2. Permitted Outfalls and their Impact from this project
   - GSD wanted to be sure that the original hydrology information that was used was accurate.
     - They have heard that the increased levels could be anywhere from 1-2” to 6-12”.
   - Gary’s biggest concerns were the increased water levels affecting the outfalls at Broadway, Louisiana, and Chase Streets.
   - The COE agreed that they would coordinate this to assure that the XP-SWMM model would have the results back to us no later than June 21st. Jim Meyers referred to Greg Moore’s letter regarding the water surface profile change from Pre and Post Project condition.
3. Ironwood Storm water pumping station
   - GSD has a concern that during the 100 or 200 year events, that they could not gain access to the pump station to do any emergency operations.
     > Imad Samara pointed out that they could gain access from the levee on the other side of the railroad. The design intent was that during flood events, the only operation would be to bring a generator for powering up the station in a power outage. Imad suggested to run a mock drill where a generator is brought out to the station.
     > GSD pointed out they would not be able to access this area to bring in a portable generator to restore power or to get a crane in that area to replace a pump during a flood event. Imad stated this type of action would not occur during a flood event. Imad stated this type of action would not occur during a flood event. GSD disagreed stating it is the most likely time for such action.
     > Jim Pokrajac pointed out that the top of concrete was above the 100 year level of protection as per the COE field trips.
   - Jim Meyer has concerns with the accuracy of the 100 year and 200 year levels and asked why there was not a levee in this area.
     > GSD wanted to reinvestigate the XP-SWMM model in this area.
     > GSD also had a concern that the existing combined sewer system for the Ironwood sub-division would back up water into basements.
   - Imad Samara pointed out that their original hydrology study indicated no impact to any structures in this area.
   - Ray Coughenour said that if the impact increased only by 1-2", it wouldn't be a problem; but if it increased to 6-12", it could be a problem (the COE will investigate these levels).
   - Ray Coughenour also indicated that 6 to 12" increase is a problem, however he did not think 1" to 2" was. It was pointed out that Imad Samara's letter of 2-7-02 shows an impact of 0.8' (10") for the 100-year event at Martin Luther King Drive.

4. GSD requests of all correspondence to and from the USEPA and IDEM regarding Gary projects
   - Sue Davis pointed out that they are currently working with Earth Tech to complete the new XP-SWMM modeling in this area. (under a different authority and project)
   - Imad Samara asked the question of the proposed detention basin east of Broadway and whether or not this would be able to handle the storm water overflow east of Broadway.
     > Jim Meyer pointed out that not even 1/3 of the cost of this has currently been appropriated and that it is currently on hold.
     > Gary has concerns with Hobart not contributing to this project.
     > If Hobart does not participate, it will affect the size and location of this area.
   - Don Smalls indicated that the river modeling should be segmented into 3 areas of impact (Chase Street, 25th and Louisiana, and Broadway).

5. GSD requests documentation to confirm that soil and erosion control measures were practiced by contractors during construction
   - GSD has requested the results of the inspections performed by the COE on these projects.
   - GSD needs documentation to assure that the necessary soil and erosion control methods were done.
   - Imad Samara pointed out the Griffith construction field office should have the necessary data and documentation (this could be made available to the GSD).
   - Ray Coughenour agreed that they will check on all quality assurances and quality controls.

   - The COE is currently finalizing the O&M
     > Imad Samara stated it would be available by the end of September 2002.
• Carmen Wilson requested that upon completion of the O&M, then Gary would have the opportunity to do final review prior to having the final manual be issued.
  ➢ Ray Coughenour concurred that the COE will submit this to not only the GSD but the other Gary agencies and the LCRBDC.

7. GSD concerns regarding drainage at the 27th and Chase Street Pump Station
• The COE agreed they will send a letter to the GSD with all of the current data regarding elevations for this area.
• The COE stated that the culvert and sluice gate were installed based upon data prior to construction.
  ➢ It was also indicated that the outlet was installed at the existing ditch level elevation could be as high as 2’ above the outfall elevation at the 27th and Chase Street NPDES permitted CSO/Stormwater discharge.
• GSD asked for the possibility of either installing a lift station in this area or lowering the invert pipe.
  ➢ COE will do the economic analysis.
• GSD indicated that in approximately December of 2003, the CSO will be separated.
  ➢ At that point in time, we would only handle storm water.
• When the new 27th and Chase Street station is completed, the existing permitted CSO will handle only storm water and the re-modeling addition will handle only sanitary.
• Imad Samara requested that the COE do the re-modeling in this area.
  ➢ Sue Davis indicated that to do this re-modeling, they would need additional money.
  ➢ Ray Coughenour indicated that he would coordinate and discuss this with Imad Samara and Sue Davis.
TO: All attendees at the Utility Coordination Meeting

FROM: Jim Pokrajac, Agent, Land Management/Engineering

SUBJECT: Preliminary minutes of Utility Coordination Meeting

DATE: June 26, 2002

Enclosed are the preliminary minutes of the Utility Coordination Meeting that we held on Wednesday, June 12th. Will you please review these minutes and make your comments, revisions, additions, etc no later than July 2nd in order that I may finalize the minutes for distribution. If you have any questions regarding these minutes, please contact me at the above number.

/sjm
encl.
MINUTES OF THE
UTILITY COORDINATION MEETING
HELD WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2002
LCRBDC OFFICE

Attendees:
Jim Flora – R. W. ARMSTRONG CO.
Lou Casale – LCRBDC attorney
Jim Fitzer – NIPSCO
Dan Gardner – LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac – LCRBDC

Via Conference Call:
Imad Samara (USACE)
Jan Plachta (USACE)
Don Valk (USACE)

A Utility coordination meeting was held on Wednesday, June 12th at 10:00 a.m. Representatives from the LCRBDC, R. W. Armstrong Company, and NIPSCO attended the meeting. Representatives from the USACE were available via conference call. Following are a list of the minutes of that meeting:

- All parties had the opportunity to review the sample letter and with minor changes, all agreed that this letter may be used to coordinate utility relocation work with the utility representatives.
- If the property the utility relocation is on is owned by that company, it will be considered compensable.
- Subordinated agreements by other utilities on those properties will only be obligated to the owner as is written in their agreement with the property owner.
- Dan Gardner pointed out that if any relocations are not compensable, that they will also be non-creditable and the LCRBDC cannot enter into an agreement due to directives from the State.
- Lou Casale pointed out that our agreements with the utilities are all easement agreements rather than permits.
- Don Valk pointed out that the COE headquarters may not compensate for these relocations if they are permits rather than easements. (This may only be an Illinois, not an Indiana, issue).
- Lou Casale is to get the information for the Stage V Phase 2 pipeline corridor to Don Valk to establish a procedure.
- Both attorneys requested a copy of the deed to show proof of ownership for that property along with a legal description of the land.
- Jim Fitzer (NIPSCO) emphasized the importance in scheduling the relocation because they have to schedule crews and material to complete this work.
- Imad Samara pointed out that we will have a pre-construction meeting prior to the start of any work and that the utilities will be informed and invited to this meeting to discuss the schedule or ask questions.
• It appears that most of the actual relocation work will need to be completed before construction - the exception would be during construction where the contractor and the utility company need to work together.
• Imad Samara suggested that we let the utilities know when we have made previous submittals (such as prints, letters, etc.) so they will not be confused with a new request.
• Jim Fitzler suggested that we include all requests in one letter to that specific utility (some utilities have multiple relocations in any given stage/phase).
• Lou Casale suggested that before paying any utility prior to construction, we need to assure that it will be compensable.
• Jim Pokrajac suggested that we contact each utility initially to request only that information the attorneys need to make a determination of compensability.
  ➢ When determination is made by the attorneys that it is compensable, the LCRBDC will send a follow-up letter enclosing information regarding the relocation and may commit to paying them in advance for engineering service knowing that it will be creditable.
• Jim Pokrajac questioned whether or not we were going to pursue any other utility relocations other than Stage VI.
  ➢ Due to funding restrictions, it was mentioned that it might be best to wait approximately 2 years prior to the scheduled signing of the right-of-entry for that upcoming segment.
  ➢ The COE will investigate the remaining scopes of work for Stage VII and Stage VIII to see if the A/E’s are obligated to complete this task.
• Jim Pokrajac pointed out that tracking of these utilities is critical because over 250 utilities will need to be relocated in the west reach.
  ➢ Jim Pokrajac will work with Jan Plachta to establish a format.
  ➢ Jim Pokrajac pointed out the importance of tracking that will help us later for crediting purposes.
  ➢ Jim Pokrajac distributed as part of the meeting “Utility Relocation Milestones” that list 17 steps that will help track each utility that may be used as a guideline in establishing a final procedure.
• It was agreed that Jim Pokrajac will meet with Jan Plachta in Chicago to discuss and review Stage VI-1 and Stage VI-2 (the first upcoming construction contract in the west reach).
• Dan Gardner pointed out that the LCRBDC should know shortly about the $2.5 million that was rescinded from them from the last biennium.
  ➢ LCRBDC will check about getting this money restored.
  ➢ Dan Gardner also pointed out that the LCRBDC is already starting on our next budget request.
• Imad Samara pointed out that COE funding may also have similar problems.
• Lou Casale suggested that at the next Real Estate meeting, we discuss the 15 month period before our next biennium and how it relates to the current construction schedule.
• It was agreed that we would try to coordinate our next utility coordination meeting in early August.
WORK STUDY SESSION  
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE  
July 9, 2002  
Bob Huffman, Committee Chairman

1. Update on 75' drainage easement (Lou Casale)  
   - Lou/Dan had call with the County on July 8th

2. Pump Station 1B union concerns  
   - Union laborers picketed town of Highland for COE contractors using non-union labor  
   - Article in the Times on June 7th  
   - Federal government cannot require use of union labor, but do require they meet union pay scale (stays in effect for duration of project)  
   - Contractor used 80% union workers on project

3. Status of COE/LCRBDC tracking program  
   - Refer to pages 1-7 (gray report) for LCRBDC submittal  
   - COE gave us preliminary sheets at last Commission meeting on June 6th; asked LCRBDC to supplement & comment  
   - LCRBDC submitted this back to COE on July 1st; COE did not agree with our modifications  
   - LCRBDC sent e-mail back to COE on July 8th stating our position and suggesting a face-to-face meeting to finalize the categories

4. Final GSD coordination meeting minutes of June 6, 2002  
   - Refer to COE/LCRBDC coordination report p. 8-11 of the attachments  
   - Some items remain to be resolved

5. Utility coordination meeting held 6/12 & 6/25/02  
   - Refer to COE/LCRBDC coordination report p. 12-14  
   - COE/LCRBDC agreed on step-by-step to complete getting final agreements

6. Other Issues  
   - Old Business  
     - INDOT/Tri-State drainage issue  
     - LCRBDC sent letter to INDOT on June 20th (See Engineering Report – attachment p. 4)
WORK STUDY SESSION
9 JULY 2002

LAND ACQUISITION / LAND MANAGEMENT
ARLENE COLVIN, CHAIRPERSON

OLD BUSINESS: (pertaining to Land Acquisition/Land Management)

Colfax to Calhoun Drainage Ditch Problem (Petition):
A response letter was sent to the ten (10) landowners who signed the petition which asked for LCRBDC to correct some problems with the Colfax to Calhoun drainage ditch. We have had no response from the landowners.

The Army Corps has agreed to clean the concrete ditch bottom from 29th and Stevenson Streets to Calhoun Street as part of an "add-to" contract with Dyer Construction. The grass on the ditch side slopes will be mowed probably by the end of July as part of the upcoming mowing contract. The Corps has also declared the isolated strip an uneconomic remnant that can be acquired and credited.

Status of the Disposition of Property:
Lou's office has received no requests from the 30+ letters sent to state agencies to purchase the 3120 Gerry Street (rental house) property. This will be LCRBDC first "disposition of property" case.

The house was appraised at $36,000 and the current renters have expressed a desire to buy the property. Discussion? Do we contact the current renters and ask if they are still interested in purchasing the property? Do we put the property on the open market?

Update on Village Shopping Center
Lou to report. He has been in contact with the Village Shopping Center owners in Boston. They are asking for proof of LCRBDC ownership of the lands. We'll be ordering title work to confirm ownership.
LAND ACQUISITION:

1.) There are no increased offers or condemnation.

2.) Land Acquisition is working with the Pittsburgh District Appraiser Reviewer Greg Dorword in the absence of a reviewer at the Chicago District. Mr. Dorword on 8 July 2002 sent us his approval of the crediting appraisal for the 200 acre Don Ewen farm at $345,000. When credited LCRBDC crediting will increase $345,000. YEAH!

3.) Update on Hobart Marsh Mitigation:
We are currently doing surveys on the first three parcels: Kim, Brinson, and Fadell (owners). When surveys are complete appraisals will be assigned. Denise Brinson may donate her tract if LCRBDC agrees to erect a memorial to the previous owner, her Dad Jon Nozrik. Discussion?

4.) Info from the Land Acquisition Committee Meeting held 10 June 2001:
Discussion on the Handicapped-Accessible Park? Meeting with LEL? (Complete the second half of the park area? Fieldhouse will come later?)

LAND MANAGEMENT:

1.) Need action to approve the mowing of levees from Burr Street to Martin Luther King Drive. Discussion on Commissioners approving awarding contract to the lowest bidder or increasing the maintenance contract cap from $3,000 to $7,500?

2.) Agreements for Highland to take over the pump station at 81st in Highland were sent to Highland on 1 July. The town attorney will review them and respond with comments to LCRBDC by 19 July. LCRBDC will then turn over documents, drawings, etc. to Town of Highland for O. and M.

3.) Update on property leases:
Chase Street Farm Stand and Berkheimers Trucking are old leases that need to be reviewed and updated. Staff will investigate and compare current market leases to LCRBDC existing leases for possible increases.
LAND ACQUISITION REPORT
For meeting on Wednesday, July 3, 2002
(Information in this report is from May 30, 2002 – June 26, 2002)

STATUS (Stage III) – Chase to Grant:
1. Final acquisitions for flowage easements east of Chase and north of the river are ongoing (DC209 to DC213). COE is reviewing the appraisal.
   • Due to the absence of an appraisal reviewer at the Chicago District, appraisals are forwarded to Pittsburgh District for review. The process takes a longer time.

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 V – Phase 2) – Indianapolis to Kennedy – North Levee:
1. Wicker Park appraisal was forwarded from Chicago to the Pittsburgh COE for review.
   • Reviewer Greg Dorward is considering a visit to Wicker Park to get first-hand sight of the golf course.

STATUS (Stage V – Phase 3) – Northcote to Indianapolis – (Woodmar Country Club):
1. Construction is 2-3 years in the future, Woodmar acquisition is not a priority.

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 1) – Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to Liable – South of the River:
1. Appraiser Dale Klezynski is completing the town of Highland appraisal and is working on the Kennedy Industrial Park. 10 of 14 residential offers have been received and recorded.
2. LCRBDC had concerns regarding insurance, indemnifications, and specifications for west reach construction and wrote a letter to the COE on May 11, 2002.
   • The COE responded on May 21 enclosing copies of insurance information from a previous project.

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 2) – Liable to Cline – South of the river:
1. The COE indicated to the LCRBDC on June 24, 2002 that they should be getting us the final real estate drawings no later than July 26, 2002.

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.

STATUS (Stage VIII – Columbia to State Line (Both Sides of River)
1. We received a call from the Gleasons’ contractor. (They are adding the addition) that the Munster Building & Planning Dept. has incorrect information about our project. They informed contractor that the COE has an easement on the 4 homes west of Hohman. We will set up a meeting with Munster to discuss this and other issues.
STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr Street, then North N.S. RR, then East (North of RR R/2) 1/2 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.

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.

MITIGATION:
1. Our first contact, Fadell, has changed her mind and will allow us access to appraise (50 acres)
2. Our second contact, Kim, has agreed to an appraisal.
3. Our third contact, Brinson, is agreeable; however, nothing can be done until her father’s estate is closed. Father Jon Nozrik owned the property. Daughter Brinson is the heir.
4. Appraiser Jeff Vale has been approved by the COE to perform appraisals for us.
May 11, 2002

Imad Samara
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

RE: Contractor requirements pertaining to West Reach construction, indemnification and insurance

Dear Imad:

Several weeks ago I requested information concerning indemnification, specifications and insurance pertaining to construction along the West Reach. This was at the request of Judy Vamos who is having considerable difficulty answering the questions of adjoining property owners concerning possible damage to their property which may be caused by construction. In response, you furnished me with what appears to be regulations or specifications pertaining to vibration monitoring for pile driving, pre-construction surveying, ground vibration monitoring, steel sheet piling and other engineering specifications. While this information is helpful, it still doesn’t completely answer the questions that the property owners are posing.

Please furnish me with a complete set of contract documents including ancillary documents such as insurance requirements, indemnifications, specifications of contractors that will be anticipated to be used in the West Reach, and in particular, on Stage VI of the West Reach. I will be able to review the documents and glean therefrom some of the information needed. Hopefully, we can formulate a response that will be satisfactory to adjoining landowners.

Your cooperation in this matter has been greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

CASALE, WOODWARD & BULS, LLP

[Signature]

Louis M. Casale

cc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
    Judy Vamos, LCRBDC
May 21, 2002

Planning, Programming and Project Management Division

Mr. Louis M Casale
9223 Broadway
Suite A
Merrillville, In 46410

Dear Mr. Casale

I'm responding to your May 11, 2002 letter regarding West Reach Construction. In your letter you requested a complete documents for the Stage VI project that includes information regarding insurance requirement. We at this time don't have a completed document for Stage VI. But, I did attached 2 sheets from the Burr Street Bettamer Levee project, which identifies the insurance requirement for that project. We do anticipate including this language as part of the Stage VI project.

I hope the information Attached is what you have requested. Please feel free to contact me if you have any more questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Imad Samara
Project Manager

CF: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
    Judy Vamos, LCRBDC
May 22, 2002

Judith Vamos
DNR - Land Acquisition
6100 Southport Road
Portage, IN. 46368

RE: 4140 West 49th Avenue
Hobart, IN.

Dear Ms. Vamos:

You have my permission to survey and appraise the above property.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara G. Fadell

bhf

2/9 348-9891
Called Mrs. Fadell, "Hi, it's Bill."
"I left a message, it may be on your voice mail."
"She called me, 4:18 PM, asked for appraisal."
"She asked for appraisal."
"She left a message."

P.S. She expressed her appreciation.
June 5, 2002

Real Estate Division

SUBJECT: Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

After careful review, the tracts highlighted in green on the attached map have been determined to be uneconomic remnants. The standing water at the bottom of the adjacent ditch significantly inhibits access to these tracts. Please be advised of the following:

1. Your office is instructed to obtain these tracts in fee. The appraisals or informal value estimates for these tracts must identify these tracts as uneconomic remnants due to inhibited access caused by standing water in the adjacent ditch which is encumbered by a permanent easement by the local sponsor;

2. If a landowner does not want to sell an uneconomic remnant tract and rejects a fair market value offer, your office cannot proceed to condemnation since the acquisition is not considered essential to the project; and

3. Your office will obtain LERRD credits for these acquisitions once all required documentation is submitted and reviewed.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact Realty Specialist Chrystal Spokane at 312-353-6400 ext 5010.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Erika L. Wilkins, Esq.
Chief, Real Estate Division

Enclosure
Copy Furnished (w/ encl):
Imad Samara, PM-PM
Judy Vamos, LCRBDC
June 6, 2002

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

I'm writing this letter to clarify the Corps of Engineers position on the letter dated May 10, 2002, that the homeowners living along the ditch in the area of Stage IV-1 North wrote to you. Since most of the letter discusses events that occurred during or as a result of construction, I asked the Area Office personnel to review and provide responses to each of the points raised in the letter. Here is the response I received:

1) A survey on June 3, 2002, indicates the top of the South embankment actually higher than the North by 0.02' near Calhoun (Sta. 1+00) and 0.92' near Colfax (Sta. 14+00). The Contractor specifically minimized soil removal on the South side of the ditch due to the existence of shallow buried oil lines in this area. Wolverine Pipeline representatives were on site during this period to assure minimized soil removal from over their oil lines. No topsoil was removed from the project site. The only soil removed was that necessary to excavate the ditch. As for "property markers", the contractor may have encountered some, especially at the West portion since heavy brush had to be removed. The contract documents did not address the existence or required reestablishment of "property markers".

2) On the North side of the ditch some topsoil stripping was done, but the same topsoil was spread back on the surface after ditch completion. Stripped topsoil contained pieces of debris, which surfaced when spread back across. The contractor removed of the surface debris that did not meet contract specification requirements for topsoil.

3) The comment on the ditch being "15 to 16 foot deep" is incorrect. The survey on June 3, 2002 revealed the following: At Sta. 1+00 (near Calhoun), top of concrete ditch liner to top of ditch is 5.17 ft. on the North side and 5.15 ft. on the South side. At Sta. 14+00 (near Colfax), top of concrete ditch liner to top of ditch is 5.12 ft. on the North side and 6.00 ft. on the South side. Elevation records are available. As for water in the ditch, there is always water flowing in the ditch bottom. On June 3, 2002, it was about 3 inches deep near Calhoun, and about 6 inches deep near Colfax. However, the water depth varies day-to-day, based on weather conditions. As for not having access to the South side to mow, it is not the water but the wet soil conditions near the ditch bottom that would prevent equipment from crossing the ditch. The wet soil conditions are the result of groundwater that continually seeps from the lower 4 to 6 feet when measured along the slope. As for the steepness of the slopes, with the exception of the area around the
structures at Calhoun and Colfax, the banks are at a 4.0 Horiz. to 1.0 Vert. slope. This is much flatter than the 2.5 Horiz. to 1.0 Vert. used on levees which are mowed using conventional mowing equipment. Refer to sheet C-8 for ditch cross section.

4) The majority of the topsoil placed was topsoil that was stripped prior to excavating the ditch. The only topsoil imported from off site was placed on the north side at about Sta. 5+00. This was in response to an owner who expressed concern that the final elevation of his property was low. All areas were seeded with the approved seed mix.

5) As for bank erosion, before the grass took hold in the lower portion of the ditch, there was minor sloughing due to ground water seepage. Now that we have a lush grass growth at the bottom, the grass is allowing only water through, with no additional sloughing observed.

One thing that we are considering is cleaning up the ditch bottom from the sloughing that took place while the grass was germinating. I will work with Jim Pokrajac to get a contractor out to clean the ditch. Please feel free to contact me if you need any additional information, or have any other questions, at 312-353-6400 ext. 1809.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]

Imad N Samara
Project Manager
24 June 2002

Mr. Robert Childress
5967 West 30th Avenue
Gary, IN 46406

Dear Mr. Childress:

RE: The Drainage Ditch Petition

We are in receipt of your petition of May 23, 2002 and have subsequently shared it with the Corps of Engineers and our Development Commissioners at our monthly meeting of June 6th. Let me state that the Development Commission is committed to working with the affected residents in achieving a workable solution to the problems you have identified. Representatives from the Commission and the Corps office had made an initial field visit to the ditch site on February 28, 2002. As a result of your petition, a second visit was made on June 3, 2002 to accurately access the statements made and the remedies possible. To reach an acceptable solution, it is my belief that all parties need to agree to the basic situation that presently exists. I am providing you an assessment by the Corps of Engineers responding to your concerns point by point as, hopefully, a way of establishing the agreed-to site conditions. Following are their responses:

1.) South 15 foot temporary work areas:
Petition states that "contractor removed all topsoil and replaced it with mostly sand, leaving the work area 24 to 30 inches lower than previously. Contractor also destroyed the southern property markers."

The Corps conducted a field survey on 3 June 2002 and found the south embankment actually higher than the north by 0.02' by Colfax and 0.92' by Calhoun. The contractor specifically minimized soil removal on the south ditch side because of the existence of shallow buried oil lines in the area. Wolverine Pipeline representatives were on site during construction to assure minimal soil removal. No topsoil was removed from the project, only the soil necessary to excavate the ditch. The contractor may have encountered property markers on the west portion of the ditch since heavy brush had to be removed, however, the contract did not address the existence or re-establishment of property markers.
2.) North 12 foot temporary work area easement:
Petition states the "contractor removed topsoil replacing it with topsoil containing asphalt, concrete, stones, and other debris."

According to the Army Corps, the contractor removed and spread back the same topsoil. Some soil did contain pieces of debris which surfaced when the soil was spread back. Contractor removed surface debris that did not meet contract specifications.

3.) Depth of Ditch:
Petition states the "ditch as explained by the Land Acquisition Agent was to be 4 ft. deep and is actually 15 to 16 ft. deep. This deep ditch retains water and prevents access to the south 15 ft. of each property to mow the grass. The banks of the ditch are too steep to mow."

Corps field studies on 3 June 2002 reveal the ditch to be 5.17 ft. deep on the north side and 5.15 ft. deep on the south side near Calhoun. There is always water in the ditch and the water depth varies day-to-day according to weather conditions. Wet soil conditions from groundwater seeping into the ditch near the ditch bottom prevent mowing equipment from crossing the ditch to mow the grass. The banks are a 4.0 Horiz. to 1.0 Vert. slope. This is flatter than the 2.5 Horiz. to 1.0 Vert. used on levees which are mowed using conventional mowing equipment.

4.) Weed Content:
Petition states that "contractor brought in replacement soil contaminated with weeds."

The majority of the topsoil spread back was the same stripped earlier. The only topsoil imported from off site was deposited on the north side for a property owner who expressed concern that his property was low. All areas were seeded with the approved seed mix.
5.) Bank Erosion:
Petition states that "since the ditch bank is wet, both sides of the ditch collapse into the ditch."

Before the new grass took hold in the lower portion of the ditch, there was minor sloughing due to ground seepage. Grass is more lush this year and the grass is allowing only water to drain. The Army Corps will clean the ditch bottom as part of an overall punch list contract.

The LCRBDC wants to work with you on these problems, however, we must follow Federal regulations and make efficient use of the money allotted to us by the state.

To conclude:

- The Army Corps of Engineers will hire a contractor to clean the ditch.

- The LCRBDC will send you an offer to purchase the 15 ft. strip of land. You will receive an offer after the land is appraised and the Army Corps reviews and approves the appraisal.

- It is the responsibility of the LCRBDC to operate and/or maintain all project lands. Accordingly, we will mow this 15 ft. strip, as long as funds are available to the Commission.

Please call 219-763-0696 if you have further questions. Thank you for your concern.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

DG/jv
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION, ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Flora</td>
<td>R.W. Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Samaha</td>
<td>COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy O'Brien</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Chay</td>
<td>IDOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don L. Weidt</td>
<td>Lake Erie Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lopez</td>
<td>Congressman Wischelley's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz McCloskey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0071
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE II - PHASE 3B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: GARCES</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $3,293,968.00</td>
<td>CURRENT: $3,477,249.66</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 05 DEC 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWARATKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $3,477,249.66</td>
<td>EARNED: $3,280,112.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Contractor completing punchlist items.

Awaiting PP-PM/ED-D responses to following issues: Completion of As-Built drawings by ED-DT

### CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0073
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE IV – PHASE 2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: GARCES</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,473,311.50</td>
<td>CURRENT: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 29 SEP 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: RUNDZAITIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td>EARNED: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Awaiting turf growth associated with generator modification.

Initiating Contract Closeout.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to following: ED-DT preparation of As-Built generator drawings. CO-S to incorporate into complete as-built set, have Chief C-O sign, and distribute internally and to Local Sponsor.

### CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0076
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE II – PHASE 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: GARCES</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $3,089,692.00</td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,186,070.75</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 22 SEP 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWARATKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $4,182,688.98</td>
<td>EARNED: $4,175,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Contractor completing punchlist items.

Finalizing quantities on all unit priced items. Awaiting final supporting data from Contractor.

**FC-76.XX - LEVEE QUANTITY OVERRUN EXCEEDING 115%**. Received revised final cross-section from Contractor. Provided Contractor CO-S review comments. Contractor believes greater settlement occurred than settlement gauges indicate. Contractor completed taking borings, which did show some additional material. Contractor finalizing quantities.

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

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D Responses to the Following Issues: Completion of As-Built Drawings by ED-DT.
**CONTRACT NO:** DACW23-97-C-0026  
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE IV-2B  
**CONTRACTOR:** DYER CONSTRUCTION  
**PR & C No:** 769388

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: GARCES</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL: $1,530,357.50</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>16 NOV 98</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT: $1,948,053.31</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>30 SEP 00</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED: $1,948,053.31</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td>30 SEP 00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED: $1,948,053.31</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td>23 JUL 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
Initiating Contract closeout. Preparing letter to forward As-Builts to Local Sponsor.  
Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following items. None at this time.

---

**CONTRACT NO:** DACW27-00-C-0003  
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE IV-PHASE 1 NORTH  
**CONTRACTOR:** DILLON CONTRACTORS  
**PR & C No:** 422358

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: ANDERSON</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,708,720.00</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>07 JAN 01</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT: $2,956,964.61</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>01 MAY 01</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,956,964.61</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td>01 MAY 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED: $2,956,964.61</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td>01 MAY 02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
PM-M working with Local Sponsor to address concerns raised by residents adjacent to ditch after construction completed.  
Initiating Contract Closeout.  
Awaiting PM/ED responses to the following: None at this time.

---

**CONTRACT NO:** DACW27-00-C-0021  
**DESCRIPTION:** BURR BETTERMENT PHASE 1  
**CONTRACTOR:** DYER CONSTRUCTION  
**PR & C No:** 198030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: ANDERSON</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,074,072.70</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>24 JUN 01</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>24 JUL 01</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td>24 JUL 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
Closeout File Approved. Preparing files for transfer to District.
**CONTRACT NO:** DACW27-01-C-0001  
**DESCRIPTION:** PUMP STA. 1A  

**CONTRACTOR:** OVERSTREET ELECTRIC CO.  
**PR & C NO:** 015179

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $4,638,400.00</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 03 DEC 02</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,714,171.99</td>
<td>CURRENT: 02 JAN 03</td>
<td>42 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,169,859.49</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $1,748,000.00</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Due to Labor Union issues, subcontractors refuse to cross picket lines. Starting to impact work.

Contractor is continuing with submittals.

Contractor has installed new seal water system motor at Hohman Station. Contractor has placed SPW-2 in service and has trained station personnel at Hohman Sta.

Rebuilt Fairbanks Morse pumps from Walnut Avenue pump station are having their impellers changed to meet contract requirements.

One (1) pump for refurbishment from South Kennedy has been rebuilt and has been tested. This pump is having it's impeller changed to meet contract requirement.

A00006 (FC-01.11 – Float Tube @ Baring Avenue; FC-01.12 – Barring Avenue Pump Sta. Connection; FC-01.15 – Cleaning Wet Well at Walnut; FC-01.16 – Walnut Ave. Trash Rack Opening Revisions; FC-01.17 – Hohman Ave. – Relocate Existing Roof Drain Piping; FC-01.18 – Structural Repairs to Discharge Box; FC-01.19 – Kennedy-Power Connection for Temp. Overload & Leak Indicator) – Preliminary negotiations conducted. Contractor reviewing issues/questions raised by Government, and follow up to complete negotiations.

A00005 (FC-01.14) – Replace Seal Water System at Hohman/Munster; $29,000.00 and 40 calendar days; Preparing Modification.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following:
A. Installation requirements for underground conductors at Baring Avenue.

---

**CONTRACT NO:** DACW27-00-C-0015  
**DESCRIPTION:** STAGE IV – PHASE 1 SOUTH  

**CONTRACTOR:** DYER CONSTRUCTION  
**PR & C NO:** 476674

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $3,862,736.65</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 09 AUG 01</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,266,494.35</td>
<td>CURRENT: 16 NOV 01</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $4,266,494.35</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 16 NOV 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $4,266,494.35</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Initiating work on few remaining punchlist items as weather allows.

FC-15.21 – Repair damage to IV-1 North Structure by automobile, additional rip-rap IV-1 North, PM directed Landscape repairs to IV-1 South levees damaged by WIND, and cleaning of IV-1 North ditch. Awaiting complete proposal from Contractor.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following items: None at this time.
## CONTRACT NO. DACW27-01-C-0008
### DESCRIPTION: PUMP NORTH 5TH AVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR:</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMOLAR</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,387,500.00</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 17 MAR 03</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>$2,417,023.93</td>
<td>CURRENT: 17 MAR 03</td>
<td>25 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED:</td>
<td>$ 779,523.93</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED:</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>FINAL W/0 D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS:

Due to Labor Union issues, subcontractors refuse to cross picket lines. Starting to impact work.

Contractor preparing and submitting submittals.

New pumps have been delivered and are in storage.

Modifications to concrete discharge boxes ongoing.

A00003 (FC-08.01) – Installation of Metering Transformer Cabinet and Electrical Connections to NIPSCO Transformer; $29,523.93 and no time. Executed and Distributed.

FC-08.04 – Delete 3 Ton Portable Gantry Crane; Awaiting Proposal.

FC-08.08 – Modify Existing Flap Valve Mounting Flange to Accommodate More Bolts. Awaiting Proposal.

FC-08.09 – Extend Access Ladder; Received Proposal – To schedule negotiations.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following items: None at this time.

## CONTRACT NO. DACW27-00-C-0035
### DESCRIPTION: PUMP 1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR:</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $1,963,400.00</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 24 JUL 01</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>$2,120,730.12</td>
<td>CURRENT: 18 SEP 01</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED:</td>
<td>$2,120,730.12</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 18 SEP 01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED:</td>
<td>$2,120,730.12</td>
<td>FINAL W/0 D. 30 APR 02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS:

As-Buits transferred to LCRBDC.

Files transferred to CO-C.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to following items: None at this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO:</th>
<th>DACWXX-XX-C-00XX</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR:</th>
<th>PR &amp; C No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>LITTLE CAL STG. VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
Design Ongoing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO:</th>
<th>DACWXX-02-C-00XX</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR:</th>
<th>PR&amp;C No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>STAGE III REMEDIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
Completing Backcheck review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO:</th>
<th>DACWXX-XX-C-00XX</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR:</th>
<th>PR &amp; C No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION:</td>
<td>LITTLE CAL STG. IV-PHASE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
Performed 100% BCOE. ED/PM/ A/E responding.
PROJECT ENGINEERING
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
For meeting on Wednesday, July 3, 2002
(Information in this report is from May 30, 2002 – June 26, 2002)

STATUS (Stage II Phase 1) 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 1, 1993.
   Dyer/Ellas Construction – Contract price $1,220,386

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

Landscaping Contract-Phase I (This contract includes all completed levee segments –
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 11/20/95. (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 August 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 August, 2002.
• Final quantities for fill are currently being tabulated so costs can be determined.

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

STAGE III DRAINAGE REMEDIAL 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. & 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 lift station for interior drainage
   C. East Reach remediation demolition – We received an email from the COE on
      February 25th, 2002, indicating we may be able to release all demo projects in a future
      8A contract.
   D. Extending the combination sewer East of Grant Street, North to our line of protection
3. Tentative schedule is to advertise in mid-July, 2002; open bids in mid-August; and
   award the contract no later than September 30, 2002.
4. We received a letter from the Marathon Pipeline Co. on April 29th, 2002, (dated April 23rd),
   along with their cost estimate for $122,000 to do a directional bore under our proposed
   culverts.
   • We sent a letter to Marathon on May 20th, 2002, enclosing section information from the
     COE, and requesting in writing that they will not need to do any re-location. (Still
     awaiting response as of June 26, 2002)
   • Received an e-mail from Marathon on June 24th with several questions that need to
     be addressed prior to their approval. (We sent to the COE on June 26th)

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 - North) Cline to Burr (North of the Norfolk Southern
Railroad):
1. IV-1 (North) The drainage system from Colfax to Burr Street North of the Norfolk
   Southern RR.
   • Current contract amount – $2,956,964.61
   • Original contract amount - $2,708,720.00
   • Amount overrun - $248,244.60 (9%)
2. The final inspection was held on August 30th, 2001, and tools & manuals were given to
   the LCRBDC.
3. We received “as built” drawings from the COE on March 13, 2002. The only item needed
   to be completed is to assure turf growth in all areas.
4. A problem was presented to the Commission at our February 7, 2002 Board meeting by
   residents north of the drainage ditch between Colfax and Calhoun.
• We agreed with the COE field representatives that we would wait through the spring growing season to see if the grass has rooted and prevents erosion. We also agreed to clean out the ditch bottom this summer so we can monitor any further erosion.
• Refer to Land Management Report for COE response to local concerns as well as LCRBDC letter to the residents.

STATUS (Stage IV Phase 1 – South) (South of the N.S. RR.)
1. Dyer Construction was low bidder. Given 450 days to complete
   • Current contract amount - $4,266,494.35
   • Original contract amount - $3,862,736.65
   • Amount overrun - $403,757.70 (10%)
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 August, 2002.
3. WIND Radio facilities:
   A. We submitted a letter to WIND on April 18th, 2002, indicating we would pay the $57,782 for their re-installation of their grounding system as per our agreement.
   • We submitted (2) checks to WIND in the amount of $57,782 for the grounding system and $4,200 to fence an open area on their property.
   • The COE anticipates repairing levee damage no later than the end of July, 2002.

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 Street stormwater pumping station has been completed.
   A. The complete auxiliary power hook-up has been completed by Austgen Electric and an inspection will be scheduled with the COE and GSD to complete this segment.
   B. A letter was sent to the GSD on May 22nd, 2002, trying to coordinate a final inspection with them, the COE, the contractor, and the LCRBDC.
   • An inspection will be scheduled no later than mid-July with the GSD, WREP, the COE, and the LCRBDC.

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 currently preparing for contract closeout. This will include submitting as-built drawings to the LCRBDC.
STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) E.J. & E. Railroad to, and including Colfax North of the NIPSCO R/W (Drainage from Arbogast to Colfax, South of NIPSCO R/W):
1. The bid opening was held on May 9th, 2000
   - The low bidder is Dyer Construction.
   - 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 Street Phase II is completed.

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr Street, then North NSRR, then East (North of RR R/W) ½ between Burr and Clark, back over the RR, then South approx. 1,400 feet:
1. We wrote a letter to the COE on May 21st, 2001, requesting final information for all utility re-locates in order that we may proceed with agreements.
2. The projected government estimate for this project is approximately $3.6 million.
   - The LCRBDC and the COE are in the process of coordinating a meeting with Mayor King to see if the City of Gary could help with the construction costs to help get Gary out of the flood plain. (This is the last construction segment in Gary.)
3. The LCRBDC received information from the COE in April, 2002, regarding the impact of a 100 year flood with this levee segment completed and also the impact with the project as is currently installed.
   - At our May 2nd, 2002 Commissioners meeting, the LCRBDC requested acreage information to show the differences in acres impacted before and after, and the DNR requested the 100 and 200 year floodplain elevations. (This was requested from the COE via e-mail on May 3rd, 2002).
   - The COE sent a letter to the IDNR regarding floodplain elevations on June 13, 2002.

STATUS (Stage V Phase 1) Wicker Park Manor:
1. Project completed on September 14, 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.
   - We anticipate a fall, 2005 advertising date.

2. A utility coordination meeting was held on November 16th, 2000 with all pipelines, utilities, etc. that will be impacted in the NIPSCO corridor West of Kennedy Ave.
   A. We have received cost information from the pipeline companies to do the work necessary to accommodate l-walls. The total cost in this corridor and for 2 directional bores west of the RR will total approximately $1.1 million.
3. We received a letter from INDOT to North Township on February 26th, 2002, indicating that rather than installing a pump station, they would divert water flows through culverts to the existing 81st St. pump station.
A. We received an e-mail from INDOT on May 21st, 2002, indicating that they would address only their own drainage. LCRBDC responded back requesting specific information. (None received as of June 28, 2002)

B. LCRBDC sent a letter to INDOT on June 20 requesting engineering information for review and re-consideration for potential “Joint Pump Station”.

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 in 1998 was $7.7 million.
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.
3. We received a sample letter from NIPSCO that they received from INDOT that appears to format much of the information we need from the utilities to proceed. (Refer to the COE/LCRBDC coordination report – V.E. cost savings items).

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 of 2004, and start construction in April, 2004.
3. We requested final Real Estate drawings at our April 22nd, 2002 Real Estate meeting. The COE has not finalized the engineering, but said the work limits will not change. LCRBDC needs to know coordinates for all different types of easements in order that we could do the legals. (ongoing)
   - COE anticipates we will be getting final real estate drawings no later than July 26, 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 1 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 July 19, 2002.

**STATUS (Stage VIII) Columbia to the Illinois State Line):**
1. The A/E award was given to S.E.H. (Short, Elliot & Henderson Inc.)
   - This project is currently on hold due to funding constraints.
2. The clay line of protection will be needed and the contractor (Kankakee Valley) estimated this cost to be $17,267.57. The COE has arranged payment with Kankakee Valley and they are currently scheduled to do this by mid-July.
3. The project is approximately 75% complete and the Lake County Highway Dept. anticipates the road being opened no later than July 26, 2002.

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

**Mitigation (Construction Portion) for “In Project” Lands:**
1. The COE advertised this portion of construction in March, 2002. The bid opening was held April 4th, 2002. The project was re-bid and the award is scheduled no later than September 30, 2002; with a construction start the end of October, 2002.
   - The COE is re-bidding this project. (4) contractors submitted their proposals in the bid process.
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 received location surveys with some elevations from GLE on May 20th, 2002, submitted them to the COE on May 22nd, 2002. (There were complications in locating several top of pipes.)

**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.
   - Labor union picketers arrived on site and at the town of Highland Public Works site on June 7 and departed on June 20 (LCRBDC sent memo of explanation to Commission members on June 13, 2002).
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 - $4,714,171.99
   - Original contract amount - $4,638,400.00
   - Amount overrun – $75,771.99 (2%)
4. **Baring Pump Station**
   - 17% complete
   - 2 pumps and motors are on site and being stored.
   - Flap gates have been delivered and are stored on site.
   - Discharge box modification work started.
   - COE coordinating with Munster & HSD to determine who will provide the portable water line.

**Walnut Pump Station**
- 41% complete
- 3 pumps have been re-built and are ready for testing.
- Electric installation ongoing.
- Mechanical trash rack being stored on site.

**S. Kennedy Pump Station**
- 37% complete
- One pump has been re-built and is being factory tested.
- Concrete discharge box modifications underway.
- New flap gates have been installed and part of the 8” discharge pipe has been removed.

**Hohman/Munster Pump Station**
- 47% complete
- Electric installation 90% complete
- 2 pumps installed and ready for operation
- 2 additional pumps received have been installed
- All new pumps and motors have been received and are in storage

5. We received the last status report from the COE on **June 21st, 2002**

**West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1B:**
1. The Two (2) pump stations included in this contract are S.E. Hessville (Hammond), and 81st Street (Highland). Overall contract work is completed.
   - A final inspection was held for both stations on September 18th, 2001. We received a letter that day listing key turnover items.
     - **We received the “as-built” drawings from the COE and a checklist for turnover on May 22nd.**

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 **June 21st, 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 37% completed
• We received a modification #3 to the contract on June 6 to add $29,523.93 to the contract for installing a metering transformer cabinet.

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.

3. We received the last status report from the COE on June 21st, 2002

4. (4) pumps and motors have been removed.

• Flap gates have been installed

GENERAL:

1. We received a letter from INDOT Consultant, Hanson Professional Services, Inc., on December 13th, 2001, regarding their upcoming construction for I-80/94 and asked for our comments and concerns.

   A. We responded to this request on January 31, 2002, and also addressed an additional concern for runoff and what precautions will be taken to handle environmental concerns. (We are awaiting a written response)

2. Minority Participation – We received an e-mail from Commissioner Huffman on April 29th, 2002, addressing some concerns with the monthly report. LCRBDC met with the COE on May 17th, 2002 – they will re-format for clarity.

   A. COE currently working on providing new format for ongoing projects. A sample was presented to the Commissioners at our June 6 meeting that appeared to meet their approval.

3. We received a letter from the Lake County Surveyors’ Office on March 15th indicating that they are presently installing a pump station in the “Hartsdale Pond” and that this could make 200,000 cubic yards of clay available for our project. (We sent this to the COE on March 21, 2002).

   A. The pumps are in place, but need electric power. The county cannot enter into an agreement with NIPSCO because they require “up-front” money for installation. (Ongoing since mid-April, 2002.)

4. Georgia Street – INDOT raising of bridge over I-80/94 approximately 7’ at bridge.

   A. This project is scheduled to be let in November 2002; construction start in spring of 2003; and completion in the fall of 2003.

   B. The field meeting was held with LCRBDC, City of Gary, COE, and several utilities and pipeline companies on April 15th, 2002.

   • We received minutes of the meeting from INDOT on April 26th, 2002.

   C. We received prints for review on June 25th (dated June 21st)
Sandy Mordus

From: "Little Calumet" <littlecal@nirpc.org>
To: "Samara, Imad LRC" <imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>; <DLWoodsmall@MAPLLC.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 9:51 AM
Subject: Fw: Proposed Drainage Structure over MAPL's 6" pipeline near Grant St., Gary, IN

Imad:

I received this from Dave Woodsmall on June 24th. It appears that locally, Marathon does not have a problem with the extension of our culverts west of Grant Street (this is in the Stage III remediation project) relative to their existing pipeline. However, Dave informed me that further review by Marathon indicates that the following questions need to be addressed. Will you please provide answers to these 3 questions to Marathon and include me in the loop.

Jim Pokrajac

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Woodsmall, D L (David)
To: littiecal@nirpc.org
Cc: Donnelly, Jeffrey A.; Straley, Matthew J.; Woods, Stephen M.
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2002 6:01 PM
Subject: Proposed Drainage Structure over MAPL's 6" pipeline near Grant St., Gary, IN

Jim Pokrajac - Per our phone conversation today, Marathon Ashland Pipe Line (MAPL) would like the following questions answered before approving the proposed installation of 24" culvert over the pipeline.

1) What is the material of the proposed culvert? If concrete, how thick will it be and will the bottom of the outside diameter of the culvert be at least 1' from our pipeline? From the drawings you submitted, it appears that the invert of the culvert will be at least 1' above the pipeline but we're not sure about the outside bottom of the culvert.

2) What is the method of installation of the culvert. The original drawings, when the culvert was stopped short of our pipeline, was jack and bore. This will not be allowed that close to our pipeline. The pipeline will have to be exposed to make sure that the Contractor knows exactly where the pipeline is when installing the culvert. Therefore what is the method of backfill around the culvert. The pipeline will have to have a sand covering and probably rock shield installed.

3) Will the Drainage Commission reimburse MAPL for the costs of inspection and materials for protecting their pipeline (estimated at $5000).

If you have additional questions, please contact me.

David Woodsmall
Marathon Ashland Petroleum LLC
219/477-4001
219/531-5422 (FAX)
DLWoodsmall@MAPLLC.com

6/26/2002
June 6, 2002

Mr. Paul Easter
Hispanic Broadcasting Corporation (WIND)
625 N. Michigan Avenue
Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Paul:

Enclosed are 2 checks in the amounts of $57,782 and $4,200. The $57,782 includes those costs incurred by WIND to replace and/or relocate and/or re-install the copper radial ground wire system for your facilities located west of Colfax Avenue and south of the Norfolk Southern Railroad in Gary, IN. This amount represents the final payment for all of the material and labor charges you have submitted to us to complete the work.

The check for $4,200 is to be used to complete the fencing around the “open drainage pit” area located east and north of your operations building. We also enclosed a copy of our letter to you dated April 23rd with a quote for this installation, the location of the fencing, and the point of contact. It is our intent that you use this money to complete the installation which, as you indicated to us, would relieve you of liabilities with your insurance company. It will be your responsibility to coordinate this installation and upon completion, it will be your responsibility for any operations or maintenance of this fencing.

If you have any questions regarding either of these 2 checks or are in disagreement with the contents of this letter, please contact me at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.

cc: Kathleen Lucas, WIND attorney
Imad Samara, COE
Tom Dela, COE
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
June 13, 2002

Planning Programs and Project Management Division

Jomary Crary
DNR, Division of Water
402 West Washington Street,
Room W264
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2541

Dear Mrs. Crary:

It was nice seeing you at Little Calumet River Development Commission Commissioners board meeting last Thursday June 6, 2002. At the meeting you requested the Burr Street Levee Maps. Enclosed in this letter are 2 sets of maps. Each set is mad up of three maps. These maps are the Pre-Project Flooding Limits, Current Flooding Limits, and Post Flooding Limits at the Burr Street Area. These maps also shows a tabulation of the elevations of the 100-Year flood Levels for each of these maps.

These maps reflect a slight correction to the maps provided at the May 2002 commissioners meeting. These maps will supersede the May 2002 maps.

If you have any questions regarding this item, please contact me at 312-353-6400 ext. 1809, or email me at imad.samara@usace.army.mil.

Sincerely Yours,

Imad N Samara
Project Manager

CF: Dan Gardner, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
June 20, 2002

Mr. John Wright, P.E.
Project Group Manager
IN Dept. of Transportation
100 North Senate Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2249

Dear John:

On May 28th, we sent you an email requesting information regarding your intent to address the drainage problems in the Tri-State bus terminal area located west of Indianapolis Blvd. and south of the Little Calumet River. We, as well as the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), need to be involved in the review process for engineering. If you haven't sent us and the ACOE prints and specs of what you propose in this area, would you please do so at your earliest convenience. In our conversation of May 21st, you verbally indicated to me that you would be installing a lift station that would be able to handle the additional amount of water that your project would be inducing into this area. You had originally indicated that you might be tying into a proposed culvert system that the town of Highland was going to install to direct storm water to their 81st Street pump station.

Due to the rain events in mid May of this year, there was an increased interest by the town of Highland, North Township, the ACOE, the LCRBDC, and a number of residents in that area. You had responded to me earlier that Merrill Dougerty said that it was too late in the development process to get agreements with local parties that would meet your schedule for construction. Is this still the case? We have recently contacted the town of Highland and they plan on gathering hydrology data for impacts to properties of their jurisdiction in that area. We already have hydraulic information from the ACOE for North Township that we received back in January of 2002. Again, if there is no possibility of entering into a joint pump station agreement, please let me know. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact either myself or Jim Pokrajac at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner
Executive Director

cc: John Bach, Town of Highland
    Greg Cvikovich, North Township
    Jim Flora, R.W.Armstrong Co.
    Jim Mari, IDNR
    Bob Huffman, LCRBDC
    Imad Samara, ACOE
    Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
    Merrill Dougerty, INDOT
TO: LCRBDC members, Lou Casale

FROM: Dan Gardner

SUBJECT: “Laborers picket Little Cal project”

DATE: June 13, 2002

On Friday, June 7th, there was an article in the Hammond Times regarding the use of non-union labor on our project for flood control of the Little Calumet River. There have been protestors outside the Highland Board of Public Works building since last week. The particular project they are protesting is the ongoing North 5th Avenue Pump Station which is located in Highland. The reality is that the Federal government cannot require that they use union labor on the project. However, the contract does require that they meet union pay scale, the Davis-Bacon wage rates as established by the Department of Labor for this area. The Davis-Bacon wage rates are determined by the Department of Labor through reviews of hourly wages paid in this area.

For your information, we have enclosed a copy of the Times article, as well as a letter from Imad Samara to Mark Lopez of Congressman Visclosky’s Office, explaining wage determinations and the wage rate review table. Our understanding is that the general contractor has used 80% union labor and only 20% non-union labor. This contract has been ongoing for several months; but in accordance with Federal acquisition regulations, the specified wage rates remain in effect for the duration of the contract. In the event that local union wage rates have increased since the award of the contract, the contractor is not required under the terms of the contract to pay more than the contract specified.

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

/sjm
encl.
Hi Imaad,

Here is the situation: Our contract indicates that the contractor is to tie into the existing pump station's potable water line, in order to provide seal water to the new pumps. The water line is in the station but, is not pressurized. Attempts to find and turn on the water to the station have been unsuccessful.

Currently there is no city water service to this Baring Ave. pump station. My conversations with the City of Munster Water Dept. revealed the following.

1. They know Munster Water Dept. has a water meter located in the pump station.
2. Their billing records, going back 20+- years, indicate no water has been used or billed.
3. They are not responsible for supplying service to customers. They maintain and are responsible for only the "water mains".
4. They say water customers are responsible for (and from) the water main tap to any building.
5. They are not willing to install a new water service.

My conversations today with Hammond Sanitary District's Rick Sutton, revealed the following.
1. No! "We are not going to put in a new water line. We have wasted too much time already". Etc...
2. Hammond's basic position is that they will not install or pay for a new water service to the pump station.

NOTE: Mark (City of Munster Water Dept.) stated that an individual within the City of Munster contacted Russell Snyder (Hammond Sanitary Dist. Board Member) and Mark indicated that Russell will bring the issue up at their next board meeting (the first week in July) and request Hammond SD to install a new water service.

Bottom line - We may need to modify the Phase 1A contract if Hammond SD will not install the water service to this pump station. I feel a water system needs to be installed prior to July 26, 2002, as I expect Overstreet start pump removal installation around this time.

Any questions???
Bob
### Project Progress Update: 6-21-02

**Pump Rehab 1B Contract C-0035 (Thileneman Const.)**
81st Station - 100% complete.
1. All contract work is 100% complete.

S.E. Hessville Station - 100% complete.
1. All contract work is 100% complete.

**Pump Rehab 1A Contract C-0001 (Overstreet Electric Co.)**
Labor union picketers arrived on 6-7-02 and departed on 6-20-02.

1. Baring Ave Pump Station - 17%+ Complete.
2. Two pumps and motors have been received and are being stored.
3. New flap valves have been delivered and are stored on site.
4. COE has been coordinating with City of Munster and the Hammond SD to determine who will be providing the potable water line (pump seal water) to this station. Hammond Sanitary Board member, Russell Snyder, is to be made aware of the problem.
5. Discharge box modification work has been started.

1. South Kennedy Ave Pump Station - 37%+ Complete.
2. Viking Engineering has removed and rebuilt one pump and the pump is at the Peerless Pump manufacturer plant. Pump has been tested and it was determined that the incorrect impeller has been installed. A different impeller needs to be installed to meet the contract’s pump performance requirements.
3. New motor control center (MCC) has been set in place. Electrical demolition of old and installation of new conduit and equipment is ongoing.
4. Concrete discharge box modifications continue.
5. Removal of the existing mechanical trash rack has been started. A new mechanical trash is stored on site.

**Hohman/Munster Pump Station- 47%+ Complete.**
1. Startup/turnover of the new SWP-2 took place on 6-7-02. The old SWP-1 removal will start soon.
2. Two standby pumps are installed and ready for operation, if needed.
3. The old sump pump has been removed and a new sump pump has been installed.
4. A portion of ventilation ductwork has been removed and a portion new ductwork has been installed.

**Walnut Ave. Pump Station - 41%+ Complete.**
1. Viking Engineering has removed and rebuilt three pumps. 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 contract’s pump performance requirements.
2. Discharge box modification work has been started.
3. A new mechanical trash rack is being stored on site.

**North 5th Pump Station Rehab Contract C-0008 (Overstreet Engineering & Const.)**
Labor union picketers arrived on 5-29-02 and departed on 6-20-02

1. N.5th. Pump Station - 37%+ Complete.
2. Sub contractor "Piping Technologies" has previously removed various pumps & motors. All new pumps and motors have been delivered and are being stored.
3. Exterior concrete work, above the discharge boxes, continues.
4. New mechanical trash rack has been delivered and is stored on site.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
111 NORTH CANAL STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60605-7206

MAY 2 2 2002

Construction-Operations Division
Calumet Area Office

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-00-C-0035
Pump Stations Rehabilitation Phase 1B
Highland and Hammond Sanitary Districts
Lake County, Indiana
Transmittal of Final As-Built Drawings and
Checklist for Turnover

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

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

Enclosed are copies of the final as-built drawings for the
subject contract, including three large size paper sets, one
small size paper set, and one set of reproducible vellum
drawings. I understand that you will provide appropriate sets of
the as-built drawings to Highland and Hammond Sanitary Districts.

A "Checklist for Turnover" that shows the status of key
turnover items for the subject contract is also attached. As
shown on the checklist, all work has been completed on the
Contract.

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

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures
May 20, 2001

Little Calumet River Pump Stations Rehabilitation Phase 1B
Highland and Hammond Sanitary Districts, Lake County, Indiana
DACW27-00-C-0035

CHECK LIST FOR TURNOVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sign-Off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• COE Preliminary Inspection for Compliance with Contract Documents</td>
<td>9-12-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Punch list items completed.</td>
<td>10-16-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Operational Pump, Controller, Motor Tests/Training/Inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SE Hessville Station:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWP-4</td>
<td>7-03-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWP-3</td>
<td>7-09-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWP-2</td>
<td>7-13-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWP-1</td>
<td>7-17-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DWP</td>
<td>7-31-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 81st. Station:</td>
<td>4-17-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DWP-1 and -2</td>
<td>5-29-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SWP-2</td>
<td>6-20-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover 5 Sets of Complete Manufacturer's O&amp;M Manuals For All Items To LCRBDC</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NOTE: Individual equipment O&amp;Ms have been provided to station personnel during equipment turnover.</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover one copy of the 81st pump station O&amp;M manual to Mike Pipta of the Highland Sanitary District.</td>
<td>11-14-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover one copy of the S.E. Hessville pump station O&amp;M manual to Jack Downing of the Hammond Sanitary District.</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover Of Guarantees and Warranties To LCRBDC</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover All Spare Parts and Tools for All Items to LCRBDC</td>
<td>10-10-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All required parts have been delivered to Hammond SD and Highland SD.</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turnover 1 Set of Manufactures O&amp;M Manuals for All Items to CELRC-PM-M</td>
<td>11-28-01</td>
<td>RAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 20, 2001

Little Calumet River Pump Stations Rehabilitation Phase 1B
Highland and Hammond Sanitary Districts, Lake County, Indiana
DACW27-00-C-0035

CHECK LIST FOR TURNOVER

| Item                                                                 | Date       | Responsible
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------
| USACE Received Contractors Set Of “Red Line” As Built Drawings      | 4-10-01    | RAC         |
| Turnover 3 large size paper sets, 1 small size paper set, and 1 set of reproducible vellum drawings to LCRBDC. | 5-20-02    | RAC         |

Additional “Non-Contract” Items Requested by Local Community

- NONE

- NONE

- NONE

- NONE

Punch list Items to be completed

- NONE

- NONE


ROBERT CRAIB
Construction Representative
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Page 2 of 2
MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-01-C-0008
North Fifth Avenue Pump Station Rehabilitation
Highland Sanitary District
Little Calumet River, Indiana
Modification No. A00003 - Executed

1. Enclosed for your file is a copy of all pertinent information related to executed Modification No. A00003, under the subject contract.

2. Any questions concerning the enclosed items shall be directed to Mr. Blair Smolar 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-PP-PM (Mod. Only) I. Samara
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) R. Craib
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) B. Smolar
LCRBDC (Mod. Only) J. Pokrajac
## 1. Contract ID Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Page of Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEE BLOCK 16C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Solicitation/Modification of Contract

- **MODIFICATION NO.**
- **CODE**
- **CHICAGO DISTRICT**
- **111 North Canal Street**
- **Suite 600**
- **Chicago, IL 60606-7206**
- **USAED, Chicago (CO-S)**
- **Calumet Area Office**
- **906 Griffith Boulevard**
- **Griffith, IN 46319**

## 3. Effective Date

- **SEE BLOCK 16C**
- **W81G6603115055**

## 4. Requisition/Purchase Req. No.

- **CODE**
- **DACW23**

## 5. Project No.

- **(If Applicable)**

## 6. Administered By

- **(If other than Item 6)**

## 7. Amendment of Solicitation No.

- **9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.**
- **9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)**
- **19A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/OFFER**
- **19B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)**
  - **X DACW27-01-C-0008 NA**
  - **21 Feb 2001**

## 8. Name and Address of Contractor

- **(Na., State, County, State and Zip Code)**
- **Overstreet Engineering & Construction**
- **4220 N. Davis Highway Sldg. B**
- **Pensacola, FL 32503**

## 9. Amendment of Solicitation No.

- **9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.**
- **9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)**
- **19A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/OFFER**
- **19B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)**
  - **X DACW27-01-C-0008 NA**
  - **21 Feb 2001**

## 10. Accounting and Appropriation Data

- **See Page 2.**
- **Contract Amount Increased $29,523.93.**

## 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.

## 12. This Item Applies Only to Modifications of Contracts/Orders

- It modifies the Contract/Order No. as described in Item 14.

## 13. Description of Amendment/Modification

- **A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO:** (Specify Authority)
- **B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/OFFER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).**
- **C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:**
- **D. OTHER** (Specify type of modification and authority)

## 14. Important

- **Contractor** is required to sign this document and return original and copies to the issuing office.

## 15. Description of Amendment/Modification

- **Contract for N. 5th Avenue Pump Station at Little Calumet River, Indiana.**
- **Reference No. R00006**
- **SS003 FC-08.01 Metering Transformer Cabinet**

- See Page 2.

## 16. Name and Title of Signer

- **(Type or print)**
- **Thomas A. Deja, P.E.**
- **Administrative Contracting Officer**

## 17. Name and Title of Contracting Officer

- **(Type or print)**
- **(Signature of person authorized to sign)**
- **5/28/02**

## 18. United States of America

- **(Signature of Contracting Officer)**
- **08 JUN 2002**

---

**STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-03)**

- **PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE**
- **30-105-2**
- **NSN 7540-01-152-8370**
E. CHANGE IN CONTRACT TIME

The contract completion date shall remain unchanged by this modification. The current contract completion date, as required by the original contract, is March 17, 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 INCREASED $29,523.93.00 from $2,387,500.00 to $2,417,023.93.

In accordance with Special Clause 28. CONTINUING CONTRACTS, funds are available only to the extent of specific amounts in formal notice to the Contractor. Funds available through and including this modification equal $779,523.93.
June 21, 2002

Mr. James Pokrajac  
Land Management/Engineer  
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Road  
Portage, IN 46368

RE: FINAL PLANS  
Lake County Design/Build – Segment B  
Chase Street over I-80/I-94  
Project No.: IM-80-1(138)10  
Des. No.: 9709110  
Georgia Street over I-80/I-94  
Project No.: IM-80-1(138)10  
Des. No.: 9303580

Dear Mr. Pokrajac:

We have completed the Final Plans for the referenced projects. We have included one set of Final Plans for each structure for your review and approval. If you have any questions or require any additional information, please contact us.

Sincerely,
United Consulting Engineers & Architects LLP

Kurt Powerbaugh, P.E.
Design Engineer

Enclosures

c: Greg Kicinski, INDOT Design/Build Project Manager  
Mike Monahan, INDOT LaPorte District Construction Engineer  
(99-403e)
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission was created in 1980 by the Indiana General Assembly to serve as the required local sponsor for the Little Calumet River, Indiana Flood Control and Recreation Project. The federal project, which was authorized for construction in the 1986 Water Resources Development Act, is designed to provide structural flood protection up to the 200-year level along the main channel of the Little Calumet River from the Illinois State line to Martin Luther King Drive in Gary.

To accomplish this protection, the federal project is being constructed in eight geographic stages, totaling 29 construction contracts. To maximize participation of local contractors and minority/disadvantaged businesses, a 40 percent goal for contracting and labor participation was proposed by the development commission and adopted by the Corps of Engineers.

Project features include:
- Construction of over 9.7 miles of set-back levees in Gary and Griffith.
- Construction of 12.2 miles of levees and floodwalls in Hammond, Highland and Munster.
- Installation of a flow diversion structure at the Hart Ditch confluence in Hammond/Munster.
- Modification of four major highway bridges along the river corridor to permit better flow.
- Creation of 16.8 miles of hiking/biking trails connecting recreational developments.

Direct project benefits:
- Protect 3,500 acres of existing residential, commercial, industrial and transportation, uses from flooding.
- Protect over 9,500 structures from flooding, of which 8,755 are residences.
- Create a 2,000 acre river/recreation corridor system.
- Project major public/state investments such as Indiana University Northwest Campus and I-80/94 (Borman Expressway) from costly flooding damages.
- Bring over $65 million in federal construction/improvement contracts to northwest Indiana.
- Allow over 1,500 acres of presently marginal land to be reclaimed for economic development/redevelopment uses along the urbanized Borman corridor.

Commission History

Preceding the development commission in the early planning and engineering studies of the river were a Governor's Study Committee in 1970 and the Little Calumet River Basin Commission - a planning group made up of representatives of the communities/counties within the river drainage basin and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (1971-1983).

These commitments by area legislators, State

Development Commission Board
- Chairman – William Tanke, Porter County Commissioners' Appt.
- Vice Chairman – Robert Huffman, Governor's Appt.
- Treasurer – Curtis Vosti, Governor's Appt.
- Secretary – John Mroczkowski, Governor's Appt.
- George Carlson, Mayor of Hammond's Appt.
- Emerson Delaney, Governor's Appt.
- Arlene Colvin, Mayor of Gary's Appt.
- Steve Davis, Ind. Dept. of Natural Resources' Appt.
- Dr. Mark Reskin, Governor's Appt.
- Marion Williams, Lake County Commissioner's Appt.
- Vacancy, Governor's Appt.

Development Commission Staff
- Dan Gardner, Executive Director
- Louis Casale, Commission Attorney
- Sandy Modus, Business Operations Coordinator
- James Pokrayac, Agent, Land Management Engineering
- Judith Vamos, Land Acquisition Agent
- Lorraine Kray - Crediting Technician
- Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission - Administrative Services Contract
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Development Commission Board

Chairman - William Tanke, Porter County Commissioners' Appt.
Vice Chairman - Robert Huffman, Governor's Appt.
Treasurer - Curtis Vosti, Governor's Appt.
Secretary - John Mroczkowski, Governor's Appt.
George Carlson, Mayor of Hammond's Appt.
Arlene Colvin, Mayor of Gary's Appt.
Steve Davis, Dept. of Natural Resources Appt.
Emerson Delaney, Governor's Appt.
Dr. Mark Reshkin, Governor's Appt.
Marion Williams, Lake County Commissioners' Appt.
Vacancy, Governor's Appt.

Development Commission Staff

Dan Gardner - Executive Director
Louis Casale - Commission Attorney
Sandy Modus - Business Operations Coordinator
James Pokrajac - Agent, Land Management/Engineering
Judith Vamos - Agent, Land Acquisition
Lorraine Kray - Crediting Technician
James Flora - R. W. ARMSTRONG & ASSOCIATES, Project Engineering Consultant
Northwest Indiana Regional Planning Commission - Administrative Services contract
**Little Calumet River Project**

*Project Manager: Mr. Imad Samara*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to the Chicago District's web site for the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project. The project includes flood control and recreation benefits along the Little Calumet River in Northwest Indiana and involves constructing 22 miles of levees and floodwalls, installing a control structure at Hart Ditch, building almost 17 miles of hiking trails and preserving over 550 acres of wetland. The project also involves relocating seven miles of river channel to allow better water flow, modifying highway bridges to permit unobstructed flow of water and installing a flood warning system. The project will protect more than 9,500 homes and businesses in Gary, Griffith, Hammond, Highland and Munster, preventing nearly $11 million in average annual flood damage. Construction began in 1990 and is expected to be completed in 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accurate and timely information is critical to the effective resolution of the many issues associated with this project. This web site has been established to provide you the information you need to stay informed about this effort and with its related issues. The site will be updated based on the needs of our site visitors. Please let us know what you need and we will attempt to provide it on the site for you.

Your e-mail comments or questions go to the project delivery team for a response.

**Authorization:**
This project is authorized under Water Resources Development Act of 1986.

**Project Description:** The project includes both flood control and recreation, it includes constructing 22 miles of levees and floodwalls,
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installing a control structure at Hart Ditch, building almost 17 miles of hiking trails and preserving over 550 acres of wetland. The project also involves relocating seven miles of river channel to allow better water flow, modifying highway bridges to permit unobstructed flow of water and installing a flood warning system. The project will protect more than 9,500 homes and businesses in Gary, Griffith, Hammond, Highland and Munster, preventing nearly $11 million in average annual flood damage. Construction began in 1990 and is expected to be completed in 2008.

**Costs:**
Total Project Cost $189,000,000  
Federal Cost 138,198,000  
Non-Federal Cost 50,802,000

**Current Status:** The project is currently in the construction phase. Approximately 45 percent of the total project is complete. The project is divided into two sections. The east reach, which is mainly in Gary, Ind., extends from Cline Avenue to I-65. The west reach covers the area from the Illinois/Indiana state line to Cline Avenue. The construction of the project is divided into eight geographical stages, totaling over 27 construction contracts. To date, 16 of the contracts have been completed, including four contracts for demolition of structures, ten levee contracts, a recreation contract on the East Reach and one landscaping contract. Contracts currently in place provide for continuing construction of the north levees form Cline to Burr and south levee from the E J & E rail Road to Colfax. Those contracts will include installation of a new stormwater drainage system north of the NS Railroad, levee work south of the NS Railroad. Other contracts in place to rehabilitate existing pump stations in Hammond, Munster and Highland.

**Project Sponsors:**
- Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
E-mail     Chicago District Home     Corps of Engineers Home
Add to mailing list
Don Rieder
H. Parker
Cynthia Busbong
Gra
agradecido

Hotel "Casa Pirula"

Reservamos el "Hotel Pirula"

Mary E. Smith, 100 Union St., Rome, N.Y.

Dr. Goodwin, 15 Main St., Union City.

For any personal information, please contact

Dr. Goodwin or Mary E. Smith.

Thank you for your kind hospitality.

"Chuck" and "Jane" from your friend,

Dr. Goodwin.
BY LAWS
FOR THE
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
ADOPTED June 6, 2002

LEGISLATION CREATING COMMISSION

The Enabling Act of 1980 (IC 14-6-29.5) created the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and that is the crucial document which sets forth the powers and authority of the Commission. Nothing in the Bylaws can override the language, spirit or intent of the Enabling Act.

BYLAWS ESTABLISHMENT


OFFICERS

Officers of the Commission are Chairman, Vice Chairman, Treasurer & Secretary.

CHAIRMAN

The Chairman is a member of the Commission and as such, has the right to full participation in the proceedings, including the right to vote.
The Chairman can speak in discussion without leaving the Chair.
The Chairman need not rise when putting a question to vote.
The form of taking a vote shall be "Those in favor, say "aye"; those opposed, say "no".

MEMBERS

Any member shall abstain if he has a direct pecuniary interest or may abstain for any other reason.
Six (6) members constitute a quorum. A majority vote of those present is necessary to take action.
A member may discuss business or make a motion while seated.
Motions need to be seconded with the exception of nominations, which do not require a second.
There is no limit as to the number of times a member can speak to a question.
Informal discussion of a subject is permitted while no motion is pending.

COMMITTEES

Committees shall be either standing committees, which have a continuing existence, or special committees, which go out of existence as soon as they complete a specific task.
Committee assignments will be chosen by the Chairperson from the preferences indicated by individual Commissioners and then committee members will choose their own committee chairman.
The policy of this Commission shall be that the Presiding Officer, or Chairperson, is a non-voting ex-officio member of all committees. Furthermore, salary per diems for committee meetings shall be allowed only for voting members of committees.

PROCEDURE OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The policy of this Commission shall be that the Presiding Officer, or Chairperson, shall not appoint the Nominating Committee. Instead, a Nominating Committee is to be chosen by the full Commission at its November meeting, by secret ballot. Each commissioner can vote for three candidates (not more than one vote for any candidate) with the top three vote getters (plurality, not majority) from all Commissioner votes becoming the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee is to meet and, considering the reaffirmed Goals of Officer and Committee Rotation Policy, report to the full Commission at the January meeting a slate of candidates, with additional nominations available from the floor.

MEETINGS

Regular meetings shall be held once a month at 6100 Southport Road in Portage, Indiana, or at any other such location as designated by the Commission. The meeting date is fixed at the previous meeting and normally will be on the first Thursday of each month at 6:00 p.m. A Work Study Session may precede the regular meeting at 5:00 p.m. The public may attend both these meetings.

The order of business (agenda) generally will be as follows:
- Call to order by Chairman
- Pledge of Allegiance
- Recognition of Visitors and Guests
- Approval of Minutes
- Chairman’s Report
- Executive Director’s Report
- Pending Business
- Standing Committees
- Other Issues
- Statements to the Board from the floor
- Set date for next meeting

The order of business may be suspended by a majority of the members present.

TRAVEL

It is understood that final approval of all claims related to travel are subject to approval of the full Commission, as are all claims, per the 1980 State enabling Act as amended, authorizing and empowering this Commission.

Definitions
1. Area Business – automobile travel, no overnight stay.
2. Indianapolis Business – for pertinent State legislative, executive or regulatory business; overnight stay not required but may be allowed.
3. Annual Conferences – as authorized by a majority vote of the Commission at a public meeting.
4. Emergency Travel – overnight travel, as needed, to be used only in situations where other authorization scenarios cannot apply for reasons of time.
5. Special Travel – travel not covered by other categories, as determined by a majority vote of the Commission at a public meeting.
Authorization to Travel (Staff includes contract employees)
1. Staff shall be authorized to travel on Area Business as deemed necessary by the Executive Director. Commissioners are authorized to travel on Area Business that is pertinent to their Committee work, as directed by Committee Chairperson.
2. Staff shall be authorized to travel on Indianapolis Business as deemed necessary by the Executive Director. Commissioners are authorized to travel on Indianapolis Business as pertinent to their Committee work, as directed by Committee Chairperson.
3. Staff and Commissioners shall be authorized to travel to Annual Conference as determined by a majority vote of the Commission at a public meeting.
4. Staff and Commissioners shall be authorized for Special Travel as determined by a majority vote of the Commission at a public meeting.
5. Staff and Commissioners shall be authorized for overnight Emergency Travel as determined through polled approval of at least six (6) Commissioners.

Authorization for Reimbursement
Reimbursable expenses shall be subject to State law and the following guidelines:
1. For Area Business -- State law on mileage reimbursement shall apply to Area Travel directed by the Executive Director. Commissioners shall be reimbursed pursuant to State law for Area Travel only if related to Committee work as directed by Committee Chairperson.
2. For Indianapolis Business -- State law on mileage shall apply. Other expenses of staff and any Commissioners related to meals, entertainment and/or salary per diem shall be governed by appropriate State law and Commission policy. Overnight stay for staff allowed upon determination by Executive Director.
3. For Annual Conferences -- State law and Commission policy as enumerated in this policy or subsequent policies.
4. For Special Travel and Emergencies -- As authorized by State law and the Commission as enumerated in this policy or subsequent policies.

Particular Travel-Related Expenses
Other travel related expenses are to be reimbursed in accordance with State law and Commission policy as enumerated in this and subsequent Commission policies.
1. Registration fees which have not been prepaid by the Commission for attendance at events related to authorized travel shall be reimbursed when supported by receipts. If staff or Commissioner fails, without valid reason as determined by a majority of the Commission at a public meeting, to attend an event at which pre-registration fee was paid, that Commissioner or staff shall be liable for any non-refundable portion of the fee.
2. Airline, bus, rail or other travel fees for Authorized Travel which have not been prepaid, will be reimbursed at prevailing “coach” or “tourist” rate when supported by receipts. If pre-paid travel is cancelled without a valid reason, as determined by a majority vote of the Commission at a public meeting, the staff or Commissioner will be liable for the non-refundable portion of the pre-paid fee.
3. Local transportation costs, parking, and/or tolls as related to Authorized Travel will be reimbursed when supported by receipts.
4. Automobile travel for Authorized Travel will be reimbursed at the current State-authorized rate.
5. Rental car expenses for Authorized Travel will be reimbursed when supported by receipts upon the approval of a majority of the Commission at a public meeting.
6. Lodging expenses at the Single Occupancy rate for Authorized Travel that are not prepaid will be reimbursed when supported by receipts. Lodging costs shall include room costs, taxes, and reasonable phone charges.
7. Meal expenses relating to Authorized Travel will be reimbursed at the maximum allowable rate as determined by State law.
8. In addition to allowable meal and travel expenses, Commissioners shall receive a salary per diem as enumerated in applicable State law, as amended.
AMENDING BYLAWS

These Bylaws may be amended by a 2/3rd vote and notice shall be given at the previous meeting.
PROPOSED PRIORTIES FOR USE OF 2001-03 STATE BUDGET DOLLARS
15 MONTH SCHEDULE (May, 2002 thru August, 2003)
Revised: July 9, 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 $93,291.88

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

$1,095,439 Estimate for mitigation costs (Figure ½ of $500,000 earlier committed. Needed for “good faith effort”) Expended to date $3,759
- 250,000

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

$ 820,439 Kennedy Industrial Park property acquisition (VI-1) – (20 parcels) Expended to date $19,126
- 700,000

$ 120,439 Utility relocation engineering money (VI-1 & VI-2) – (approx. 16 relocates) Expended to date $0
- 75,000

$ 45,439 Estimate of ongoing title work costs for crediting purposes Expended to date $25,065
- 45,439

-0- Items not included in budget Expended to date $98,903.98

Total expenditures to date as of 7/9/02 ............ $510,731.47

Remaining monies available for drawdown as of 7/9/02 ............ $1,269,453

______________________________

REMAINING $2.5 MILLION CURRENTLY RECEIVED 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
Sandy Mordus

From: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
To: "Fahey, Sean" <SFahey@dnr.state.in.us>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2002 1:56 PM
Subject: Re: Little Calumet follow Up.

Sean:

We'll miss you at the meeting. I did send you and Mark Lopez an e-mail on June 26th announcing the change in the meeting date from July 3rd to the 9th but I did not send you a full packet of agendas in the mail. I will send a package back with Jomary tonight. I'll also give a copy of your e-mail to Dan and he will get back to you on status of items. I'll let you know as to the date of our next Commission meeting in August as soon as it is confirmed tonight. Hopefully, you'll be able to make the August meeting. Talk to you later,

Sandy

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Fahey, Sean" <SFahey@dnr.state.in.us>
To: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>; <littlegal@nirpc.org>
Cc: "Crary, Jomary" <jcrary@dnr.state.in.us>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2002 1:31 PM
Subject: Little Calumet follow Up

> Sandy/Dan,
> 
> I never received a packet or email regarding the meeting tomorrow. No rush.
> You could send it back with Jomary as she will be attending the meeting tomorrow.
> 
> Also, since I have missed the last meeting (or two) I need to follow up on a few items:
> 
> 1 - What is the status on mitigation? What additional properties are being targeted and what timeline is expected?
> 
> 2 - Burr St discussion - What have been the results of the conversations with Gary?
> 
> 3 - FHWA and COE - Have all the appropriate approvals been secured from the Federal Highway regarding creditable work?
> 
> 4- Local contribution - what contact has been made with communities along
> the rest of the rout? Has a list of stakeholders been created? Are meetings
> planned to discuss their contribution?
>
> 5- Operation & Maintenance - What is the plan for turning this over to the
> communities?
>
> I will check back when I return in a couple of weeks.
>
> Thanks.
> Sean
>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash position - General fund</td>
<td>$85,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease Movies due this Dec.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase St. Farm Aand ($1,700 mo.) 6 mo.</td>
<td>$10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Towers ($1,400 mo.)</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental House ($300 mo.)</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$20,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD interest due this Dec. ($250,000)</td>
<td>$3,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Feb, Mar, Apr, May) ($200,000 CD)</td>
<td>$5,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$9,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Market interest</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(June 30, 02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30</td>
<td>$40,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>$14,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28</td>
<td>$15,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Interest</strong></td>
<td>$497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 9, 2002
HDA-IN

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

SUBJECT: Federal Highway Administration support for allowing non-federal credit for interstate bridge improvements related to project specifications by the Indiana Department of Transportation

Dear Mr. Gardner:

It was a pleasure to speak with you today about our efforts to work with the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the Little Calumet River Flood Control/Recreation Project. Attached is a copy of our letter of February 15, 2002, where we documented the position of our Division Office about the ability of Federal-aid Highway funds to be matched with funds provided by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. You requested I provide a written status of our request to work with the Corps of Engineers' office to find ways to develop the matching credits for this project.

I am currently seeking assistance from the Illinois Division office of the Federal Highway Administration. According to their Finance Manager, they have had a local project that utilized funding from both the Federal Highway Administration and Corps of Engineers as a credit, as you are seeking for your project. I have asked the Illinois Division to provide me with additional information of how this was accomplished. The project office involved was the Corps' office in St. Louis, Missouri.

I would ask you allow me three weeks to find out more about how this was done for the project in Illinois. At that time, we can make a decision as to how to proceed. If this is acceptable, please let me know. I can be reached by telephone at (317) 226-7475, or by e-mail at: Jay.DuMontelle@FHWA.DOT.GOV.

Sincerely Yours,

Jay DuMontelle
Finance Manager

Attachment
February 15, 2002

Mr. Imad Samara, Project Manager
Little Calumet River Flood Control/Recreation Project
Lake County, Indiana
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206

SUBJECT: Federal Highway Administration support for allowing non-federal credit for interstate bridge improvements related to project specifications by the Indiana Department of Transportation

Dear Mr. Samara:

The Indiana Division office of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has been requested by the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, the non-federal sponsor with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on the Little Calumet River Flood Control/Recreation Project, to rule on legal authority and willingness to allow Federal Highway funds spent by the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) on required bridge and highway improvements on I-80/I-94 (Borman Expressway) in Lake County to be credited to the non-federal items of cooperation.

We understand the items listed seeking non-federal credit were spent by the non-federal agency (INDOT) in conformance to plans prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and work was completed in a timeframe compatible with the needs of the Federal Flood Control/Relocation project. We also understand that INDOT used funds allocated to the state of Indiana for interstate highway purposes and all appropriate regulations regarding their use were followed. It is with this background that the Federal Highway Administration, Indiana Division office, is ruling that the total funds spent by INDOT on the highway and bridge improvements along the I-80/I-94 (Borman Expressway) corridor that are specifically related to the required highway/bridge improvement called for in the Federal Flood Control/Recreation project be eligible to be fully creditable to the non-federal side of the project ledger.
Mr. Imad Samara  
February 15, 2002  
Page Two

INDOT and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission have worked closely together to schedule the needed highway and bridge projects to be consistent and timely with the Federal project construction requirements. It was always contemplated that the State's and the local work would be eligible and seek credit at the appropriate time. That time is now. We concur with the full crediting for the non-federal side of the project expenditures. Following is a detailed breakdown by INDOT of the expenditures by project.

The four principle projects submitted for credit are:

1. Indianapolis Boulevard (US 41) bridge over the Little Calumet River;
2. Grant Street culverts/bridge reconstruction over the Little Calumet River at the southern toe of the Grant Street/I-80/I-94 interchange;
3. Georgia Street – I-80/I-94 culverts widening over the Little Calumet River, in Gary; and
4. Cline Avenue (SR 912) bridge and approaches widening/elevation over the Little Calumet River.

I trust this will meet your needs to grant full non-federal credit to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Corporation. If you have any questions, please call me or Jay DuMontelle at (317) 226-7475.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
William R. Gary White  
Assistant Division Administrator

CC: Congressman Peter Visclosky  
Jeff Viohl, Governor’s office  
Commissioner Bryan Nicol, Indiana Department of Transportation  
Dan Gardner, Little Calumet River Basin Development Corporation
**CURRENT LEASES – 2002**

<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) 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</td>
<td>Current agreement since June 18, 1997 (No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Towers (Includes Ameritech)</td>
<td>$1,400 per month</td>
<td>$16,800</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>Berkheimer</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</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

$3,900 monthly
### Cash Position - January 1, 2002

**Checking Account**
- Land Acquisition: 14,521.85
- General Fund: 171,753.88
- Tax Fund: 0.00
- Investments: 1,530,299.10
- Escrow Account Interest: 100.57
- Total Receipts: 1,716,775.40

**Receipts - January 1, 2002 - June 30, 2002**
- Lease Rents: 26,700.00
- Interest Income (from Checking & First Natl.): 14,835.92
- Land Acquisition: 373,121.67
- Escrow Account Interest: 396.58
- Misc. Income: 911.40
- Proceeds from Voided Checks: 1,500.00
- 37254 N. Nimetz: 1,500.00
- Total Receipts: 418,166.07

**Disbursements - January 1, 2002 - June 30, 2002**

**Administrative**
- 2001 Expenses Paid in 2002: 94,596.71
- PER DIEM: 3,700.00
- Legal Services: 5,386.98
- NRPC: 69,719.39
- Travel & Mileage: 705.12
- Printing & Advertising: 539.41
- Bonds & Insurance: 6,070.75
- Telephone Expense: 3,180.82
- Meeting Expense: 1,955.08
- Total Disbursements: 453,822.48

**Land Acquisition**
- Legal Services: 41,117.04
- Appraisal Services: 21,550.00
- Engineering Services: 41,578.39
- Land Purchase Contractual: 22,526.00
- Facilities/Project Maintenance Services: 8,555.00
- Operations Services: 0.00
- Land Management Services: 101,700.82
- Surveying Services: 7,355.00
- Miscellaneous Expenses: 380.00
- Economic/Marketing Sources: 18,664.62
- Property & Structure Costs: 0.00
- Moving Allocation: 6,521.35
- Taxes: 0.00
- Property & Structures Insurance: 65,905.21
- Utility Relocation Services: 0.00
- Land Capital Improvement: 345.00
- Structural Capital Improvements: 9.00
- Bank Charges Mercantile: 26,178.50
- LCRBDC Money Market Payback: 0.00
- Total Disbursements: 453,822.48

**Cash Position - June 30, 2002**

**Checking Account**
- Land Acquisition: 434,930.00
- General Fund: 1,132,982.20
- Tax Fund: 0.00
- Investments: 1,651,468.67
- Escrow Account Interest Available: 457.13
- Total Investments: 1,812,648.49

---

**Available**
- Money Market: $3,901
- Money Market: $6,755
- Money Market: $14,893
- Money Market: $15,386
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 M126.03

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.
CUSTOMER RECEIPT Not Negotiable
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 reaggregate substitute securities for the (buyer) will be subject to (seller’s) ability to satisfy any lien or to obtain substitute securities.
Money Market Account 0573 -- Sand money
Account opened 11/16/00
Balance in account as of June 28, 2002 - $140,476.85

- $1,380 was paid to South Shore Marina (installing handrails at breakwater) on 6/13/02

Interest earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month, 2000</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$285.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$578.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$555.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$460.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$477.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$425.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$440.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$411.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$411.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$412.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$373.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$325.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$256.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$233.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$210.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$180.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$187.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$177.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$179.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$172.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest money earned $6,755.36
Money Market Account 3285 – Special Funds of $1.5 million ($1,500,055 actually deposited)
Account opened 10/19/00
Balance as of June 28, 2002  -  $17,722.63

Interest earned:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October, 2000</td>
<td>$ 1,020.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2000</td>
<td>$ 3,071.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2000</td>
<td>$ 2,916.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2001</td>
<td>$ 2,556.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2001</td>
<td>$ 1,555.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2001</td>
<td>$ 1,360.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2001</td>
<td>$  978.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2001</td>
<td>$  870.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2001</td>
<td>$  257.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 2001</td>
<td>$   94.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2001</td>
<td>$   64.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2001</td>
<td>$   32.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2001</td>
<td>$   22.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>$   17.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2001</td>
<td>$   14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2002</td>
<td>$   10.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>$    9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2002</td>
<td>$    9.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>$    9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2002</td>
<td>$    9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2002</td>
<td>$    9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest money earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14,893.12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Money Market Account 3376 – Gary Parks & Recreation Dept.
Account opened 1/16/01
(Monies earmarked for Gary Parks is $394,540)
As of June 28, 2002 - Current Balance $389,914.95

Interest earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month, 2001</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$777.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$1,467.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$1,520.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$1,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$1,403.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$1,311.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$1,090.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$669.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$648.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$789.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$667.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$640.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$577.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$494.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$514.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$489.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$492.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$476.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest money earned $15,385.54
Money Market Account 8805 – LEL monies
Account opened 7/18/01
Balance in account as of June 28, 2002 - $155,384.24

2 lease options with LEL:

- $ 45,460 (upon signing of lease-9/99) $ 21,500 (rec’d 12/98)
- $ 45,460 (rec’d 9/00) $ 21,500 (rec’d 12/99)
- $ 42,660 (rec’d 9/01 – lease reduced because handicapped park property was taken out of original lease) $ 21,500 (rec’d 12/00)

- $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

Interest earned:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></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>Interest money earned</td>
<td>$3,901.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED PRIORITIES FOR USE OF 2001-03 STATE BUDGET DOLLARS
15 MONTH SCHEDULE (May, 2002 thru August, 2003)
Revised: July 9, 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 $93,291.88

$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 $3,759

$ 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 $19,126

$ 120,439
- 75,000 Utility relocation engineering money (VI-1 & VI-2) – (approx. 16 relocates) Expended to date $0

$ 45,439
- 45,439 Estimate of ongoing title work costs for crediting purposes Expended to date $23,065

-0- Items not included in budget Expended to date $98,903.98

Total expenditures to date as of 7/9/02........... $510,731.47

Remaining monies available for drawdown as of 7/9/02........... $1,369,453

_____________________________________________________

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 recision
Mark Your Calendars for NAFSMA's 2002 Annual Meeting in New Orleans!

Key topics to be addressed include:
- Renewal of the Water Resources Development Act, Corps Reform Issues, Wetlands Regulatory Issues, NPDES Stormwater Phase I and Phase II Issues
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) regulation, Security Issues, FEMA Mapping, and other Floodplain Management Issues

Hotel Information:
Reservations can be made by calling the Royal Sonesta Hotel at (504) 586-0300. Please mention you are attending the NAFSMA meeting to receive the discounted rate of $159/single or double.

Preliminary Agenda

Mon., September 9th
Board Dinner (offsite)

Tues., September 10th
8am - Noon:
- Board Meeting
9am - Noon:
- Exhibit Set-Up
11am - 5pm:
- Registration
1pm - 5pm:
- General Session
Evening Event

Wed., September 11th
7:30am - 9am:
- Registration & Continental Breakfast
8am - 5pm:
- General Session
Noon - 1:30pm:
- Lunch/Committee Meetings
Evening Event

Thurs., September 12th
7:30am - 9am:
- Continental Breakfast
8am - 5pm:
- General Session
Noon - 1:30pm:
- Lunch/Committee Mtgs.

Fri., September 13th
8am - 9am:
- Business Meeting/ Breakfast
9am - Noon:
- General Session
Upcoming NAFSMA Meetings

NAFSMA's 2002 Annual Meeting!
September 10 - 13, 2002, New Orleans, LA

NAFSMA's 2002 Annual Meeting will be held from September 10-13, 2002 in New Orleans, Louisiana. Mark your calendars and click on the links below to access information. We hope to see you there!

Hotel Information:
Royal Sonesta Hotel
(504) 586-0300 - Reservations Line
300 Bourbon Street in New Orleans, Louisiana and on the web:
http://www.sonesta.com/neworleans_royal/

Room Block Dates: September 10 - September 13, 2002
Room Rates: $159 for single or double occupancy. (Be sure you mention you are attending NAFSMA's Annual Meeting in order to receive this discounted rate.)
Conference Coordinator, Sheila Reilly: For further information or information about exhibiting at this meeting please call (202) 218-4122.

Preliminary Agenda (.pdf) <<click here>>
Registration Form (.pdf) <<click here>>

Spring 2003 Legislative and Regulatory Meeting
Monday, March 24 - Tuesday, March 25, 2003

Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport
2799 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, VA 22202 USA
Telephone: 703.418.1234

Room Rate: $150 single (current government rate)

Please note that space is limited for this meeting. Members are urged to make reservations and registrations early. Only 45 spaces are available, including E members and Committee Chairs. The agenda from the 2002 Meeting is provi

The preliminary agenda for the 2003 meeting will be available by January 20. The meeting will include organized Hill and agency visits as appropriate on March 25.
From: "huffmun" <huffmun@email.msn.com>
To: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 6:31 PM
Subject: Re: Sandy here

>From the PDF file on the web page:
"Key topics to be addressed include:
Renewal of the Water Resources Development Act, Corps Reform Issues,
Wetlands Regulatory Issues, NPDES
Stormwater Phase I and Phase II Issues,
Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)
regulation, Security Issues, FEMA
Mapping and other Floodplain
Management Issues."

Well, the topics are ones in which we have an interest, but who are the speakers and how can we gain from attending? If it's nothing more than a big comiseration event I doubt if attendance would help us any.

Mark keeps bringing up stormwater phase I and phase II rules but so far I haven't seen any evidence that we have a role to play there. Same for TMDL. I suspect security will be more of an issue for providers of drinking water.

Do you have Sheila's email address? If you do please ask her to notify us when they have a more detailed schedule -- who will speak on what topic, etc.

Thanks. Bob

----- Original Message -----  
From: Sandy Mordus  
To: huffmun@msn.com  
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 1:24 PM  
Subject: Sandy here

Bob:

I emailed Sheila Reilly, who is the conference coordinator for NAFSMA, and she informed me that they are finalizing an agenda but it is not available at this time. She will get it to me as soon as it is available. Meanwhile, you can go to [www.nafsma.org](http://www.nafsma.org) and pull up "upcoming meetings". The preliminary agenda listed there is all that they have now. It pretty much covers the same topics as any other year. I had one copy printed out that I
gave to Bill at the Retreat meeting.  
Let me know if you can't find it.  
Sandy
Hi, Sandy!

Susan is busy working on the agenda for NAFSMA's annual meeting but most of the topics are listed on the postcard. The sessions that will be discussed and are of most interest to your board members are WORDA 2002, Corps Reform Issues, and FEMA Mapping. The topics are listed on the postcard to the left of the agenda.

We hope to have more attendees from Little Calumet at this year's meeting. We missed having the whole group at last year's conference. As soon as Susan finalizes the agenda, we will go out with another mailing and post the updated information on our website at www.nafmsa.org <http://www.nafmsa.org>.

I hope that helps for now. Please don't hesitate to contact me or Susan, if you have any other program related questions.

I hope we see you in New Orleans!

Sheila

Sheila J. Reilly
The Carmen Group, Inc.

-----Original Message-----
From: Sandy Mordus [mailto:smordus@nirpc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 12:43 PM
To: Reilly Sheila
Subject: NAFSMA conference

Sheila:

I would like to know if NAFSMA has put out a flyer on the conference program for New Orleans. We received a post card but the Board members asked about a program so they could see what topics would be of interest. They are still speculating on attending. I think at least several are planning on it. Could you please let me know if a program is available yet to members?

thanks,
Sandy Mordus  
Business Manager  
Little Calumet River Basin  
  Development Commission  
6100 Southport Road  
Portage IN 46368  
219/763-0696  
smordus@nirpc.org <mailto:smordus@nirpc.org>
RESULTS OF REAL ESTATE MEETING
27 JUNE 2002
ARMY CORPS and LCRBDC

IN ATTENDANCE TODAY:

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

COE
  Imad Samara
  Chrystal Spokane

LAND ACQUISITION:

1. UPDATE ON PRIORITY ACQUISITIONS
   Judy reported the following:

   a. East Reach 18 properties left
   We're honoring only offers already sent (2). The remaining (16) are on hold.

   b. East Reach Remediation 26 properties left
   We're honoring only offers already sent (19). The remaining (7) are on hold.

   c. Burr Street Betterment Levee
   We're on hold for 8 remaining offers not sent yet.

   d. West Reach Stage VI-1 and Stage VI-2
   Ten of 14 offers sent are in process of closing. Town of Highland appraisals due 7/19/02. Interim Corps Appraiser Reviewer Greg Dorward of the Pittsburgh District has a way to shorten appraisal time for Kennedy Industrial Park. He'll be contacting Dale Kleszynski.
   (ACTION: Judy/LCRBDC)

2.) UPDATE ON APPRAISAL REVIEW STATUS
   a. Chrystal reported that the interim Appraisal Reviewer Greg Dorward:
      - is reviewing DC 209 to 213
      - has reviewed and approved DC 83, DC 289, DC 345 (all for crediting)
      - needs a site visit to Wicker Park (DC 1198)

   b. Greg is enforcing the federal regulation that "properties that need appraising and were acquired from other government agencies (i.e., Lake County Park Department or the Lake County Commissioners) should be appraised for their land value at their acquisition date, not the current date." The DC 216's (A, B, E) appraisals will have to be modified.
   (ACTION: Judy/LCRBDC)
c. Greg also needs to know if the Lake County Park Department or Lake County Commissioners used federal funds to acquire the lands they transferred to us. If they did, those properties can't be credited. It would be "double dipping' if LCRBDC claims credit for the project after federal funds were already used. Lou will write a letter assuring the Corps that the tracts were purchased with local money only. (ACTION: Lou/LCRBDC and Greg/COE)

c. Appraiser Jeff Vale has been approved by the Corps to complete contract appraisals for LCRBDC.

3.) REVIEW OF WEST REACH ACQUISITION SCHEDULE TO FUNDING
Discussion was held about the Corps advertising for a Stage VI-1 and VI-2 construction contract in October of 2003 and the LCRBDC not having enough money to make offers. October of 03 is the deadline for acquisition. LCRBDC will not have enough funds to acquire those tracts, do utility relocations, and acquire mitigation tracts in the Hobart Marsh. It was agreed to continue forward until the money runs out. (ACTION: COE and LCRBDC)

4.) MITIGATION – HOBART MARSH
Judy reported that:
a. First contact Mrs. Barbara Fadell has changed her mind and will allow an appraisal.
b. Second contact Dr. Howard Kim will allow an appraisal.
c. Third contact Ms. Denise Brinson will allow an appraisal and may donate her land if a memorial, a tribute to her late father Jon Nozrik, is built on the land.

Judy will start appraisals after Jim completes the legal descriptions. (ACTION: Jim and Judy/LCRBDC)

5.) CREDITING STATUS
a. There is no updated credit report today, however, Lorraine reported she has been asked by the Corps and is working on an estimated amount for the crediting backlog, those tracts acquired before 9/26/90 (the Local Cooperative Agreement signing). The Corps has requested it of LCRBDC because the Congressman's office requested it of them to get an accurate picture of everything that is and could be credited. (ACTION: Lorraine/LCRBDC)
6.) **STATE DRAWS – PROBLEM WITH CORPS APPROVAL**
   a. Chrystal asked that LCRBDC remove the term "Land Management" when approving invoices with Jim’s name. It’s a wording problem. Only "Land Acquisition" is creditable. "Land Management" is not. Sandy will remove the term.  
   (ACTION: Sandy/LCRBDC)

7.) **INDEMNIFICATION FOR DAMAGES ON WEST REACH PROPERTIES**
   Imad has provided Lou with language from previous contract specs to use in a letter to landowners who are worried about damage to pools, sheds, fences, etc. at construction time. Lou said the language that the "contractor will indemnify the landowner for collateral damage done to their property" is inadequate and he will write a sentence and have the Corps approve it. Judy can then write to the landowners and they in turn will sign their offers.  
   (ACTION: Lou/LCRBDC)

**ENGINEERING:**

1.) **STATUS OF FINAL DRAWINGS ON STAGE VI-2**
   Jim had asked the Corps to modify Stage VI-1 and Stage VI-2 real estate drawings because of an overlap. Some landowners were listed as acquisitions in both stages. Imad and Chrystal brought the new drawings today.

2.) **THE 75 FT. DRAINAGE EASEMENT**
   Lou is working on scheduling a meeting with Lake County Attorney John Dull to discuss the 75 ft. easement. It was mentioned that Appraiser Dale Kleszynski should be (and is) completing appraisals mindful of the easement even though it does not appear on any surveys.  
   (ACTION: Lou/ LCRBDC)

3.) **KENNEDY INDUSTRIAL PARK MODIFIED DRAWINGS**
   The Corps has modified the acquisitions in the Kennedy Industrial Park, eliminating some planting zones and temporary work area easements. Imad brought the new drawings today and Jim will now have new surveys made for the appraisal.

**NEXT MEETING:** Monday 30 July 2002, 10:00 am at LCRBDC office

**JV 7/1/02**
3 June 2002

Mr. Howard Hee Han Kim, et al
34 Ramsgate Drive
Palos Park, IL 60464

Dear Mr. Kim, et al:

RE: Permission to survey and appraise your property at
5400 Block Liverpool Road, Town of Hobart, Lake County, IN

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources wishes to establish contact with you for permission to survey and appraise the above referenced land for a possible purchase. Our file shows that you are the owners of the property. The property has been designated for use by the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project in Northwest Indiana.

The Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project is a federal construction project of the Army Corps of Engineers which is building levees, ditches, and pump stations along the Little Calumet River to flood-protect over 9,500 structures. Your property would be used for mitigation purposes and will be appraised for its fair-market value. Your permission does not obligate you to sell; the permission will allow us access to survey and appraise the land only. You may accompany the surveyor and appraiser and they will contact you as to date and time.

Would you please write a small note of permission or refusal to survey and appraise the land and mail it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope? I have a few questions about the property and ask that you please call me at 219-763-0696 to discuss this matter further.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Judith (Judy) Vamos, Land Acquisition
Indiana Department of Natural Resources

Enclosure:
24 June 2002

Ms. Denise Brinson
3370 Dunlap Street North
Arden Hills, MN 55112

Dear Ms. Brinson,

RE: Lake County Trust # 1935 – consisting of three (3) tracts west of Liverpool Road in Hobart, Indiana. Heir Denise Brinson.

Thank you for speaking with me on 21 June 2002 and leaving a message this morning about your late father’s estate. My letter today is to confirm our conversations and reiterate the details concerning our conversations.

As I explained to you your property will be surveyed and appraised for its fair market value. An offer will be sent from the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The property will be used for wetland mitigation purposes for the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project.

As you explained to me you are willing to give us permission to survey and appraise your land, however, nothing can be done until after your father’s estate is closed. At this time you don’t know when that will be. I’ve also spoken with your attorney, Mr. Stephen Nelson, and he has given me the same information.

I send my thanks for your cooperation and ask that you let me know periodically the status of your father’s estate so we may proceed with a survey and appraisal.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Judy Vamos

Judith (Judy) Vamos, Land Acquisition
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT
For meeting on Wednesday, July 3, 2002
(Information in this report is from May 30, 2002 – June 26, 2002)

NON-PROJECT LAND MANAGEMENT
A. Handicapped-Accessible Park
   1. At the Land Acquisition meeting held 6/10/02, it was decided to meet with LEL reps to get update report on their involvement with the park.
B. Gleason Park-Driving Range
   1. Construction started on April 15, 2002 for the area east of the parking lot and north of 30th Avenue. (Currently approx. 75% complete as of June 26, 2002 — no contact from city of Gary at this point in time.)

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 August, 2002.
   2. The LCRBDC agreed that we would initially inspect and accept the projects on an individual basis to relieve the contractor of his obligations. However, we will require a procedure to mutually sign off with the COE to accept O & M responsibility. (COE currently working on this procedure.)
      • We sent out requests on February 5th, 2002, to all project communities to update and fill out information requests for flood response plans and points of contact. This will be incorporated into the O&M manuals.
      • We have received responses from Gary, Munster, and Highland and submitted this information to the COE. We are still awaiting response from Hammond.
   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.
      • We are currently gathering information for costs and who might accept responsibility for each task.
B. Emergency Management/River Monitoring
   1. It is our understanding that the GSD is currently monitoring river levels as part of the emergency response participation plan.
   2. 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 is currently being formulated with information received from the COE in the final O&M Manual.
   3. We received a script for closure structure video from Gene Kellar on January 9, 2002 to review and edit.
      • We completed an introduction to this video which will be done by Jeff Miller, Director of Lake County Emergency Management, on June 24, 2002.
      • We anticipate a copy for review and comments no later than July 12, 2002.
C. Portions of west reach pump stations in Hammond and Highland are being 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. **Attorney Casale has been** working with Highland (John Bach/Mike Griffin) to put together an agreement whereby the community/LCRBDC/COE can mutually sign off for construction acceptance, but the community assumes O&M responsibility. (Ongoing)
   - Submitted to Attorney Casale on October 5, 2001 (Ongoing)

2. We received “as built” drawings for pump station 1B on May 29th, 2002. Still awaiting interlocal agreement for turnover.

**General Items:**

1. A letter was sent to the COE on April 8 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 growth of our native grasses and landscaping. *(Still awaiting response as of June 24, 2002.)*

2. A memo was sent to Attorney Casale on May 28th, 2002, enclosing a modified list of current leases showing LCRBDC annual income. We also requested review of several existing leases. *(Ongoing)*

3. **We have received a petition from 10 landowners between Colfax and Calhoun citing problems and requesting action on the ditch easement on their property.**
   - We requested that the COE review the problem and give us answers for acquiring, crediting, and condemning the isolated strip. *(1-3)*
   - We received a letter from the COE dated June 5, 2002 that declares the isolated strip an uneconomic remnant. It also clarifies regulations concerning the acquisitions from Colfax to Calhoun. *(4)*
   - We received a letter from the COE on June 6, 2002 that clarified the concerns of the Colfax-Calhoun landowners petition. *(5-6)*
   - We responded to the landowners concerns on June 21, 2002. *(7-9)*
26 April 2002

Ms. Erika L. Wilkins, Chief, Real Estate
Army Corps of Engineers Real Estate
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606

Dear Erika,

RE: Decision to purchase an isolated trip of land in Stage IV-1 North.

For the last three months we’ve discussed at real estate meetings a problem the LCRBDC is having with a ditch easement on landowners DC 448, DC 451, DC 450, and DC 455 property in Stage IV-1 North. I ask you to refer to the attached map as the story is explained.

The LCRBDC obtained a permanent ditch easement (yellow) and temporary work area easement (pink) from the landowners (red houses). The ditch is approximately 57 feet wide and 5 feet deep, is completely constructed, and does have standing water in the bottom. The landowners own the strip of land between the ditch and railroad (white), yet can’t get to the isolated strip to cut their grass. They must travel parallel to the strip to either Colfax Street on the west or Calhoun Street on the east to gain access.

The LCRBDC has no right-of-entry to the isolated strip of land in order to cut the grass on our regular summer mowing schedule. To add the land strip to our grass-cutting schedule the LCRBDC would need to purchase the isolated strip in fee or impose an easement on it (numbers 1 through 10 in circles).

Would you please review the map and give me your response to the following:

1.) If we acquire an easement or a fee purchase of the property would the Corps allow us credit toward the project for the isolated strip?

2.) If you agree that the strip is considered an uneconomic remnant and the LCRBDC should purchase the strip in easement or fee, could the LCRBDC condemn a landowner who refused to sell?
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If your response is positive I will prepare Informal Value Estimates (the maximum is now $5,000) for Corps appraisal review, then send the offers to all the landowners. If you have any other suggestions to solve this problem, please inform me. I welcome your input.

Please accept my thanks for your cooperation and you me call if you have questions.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Judith (Judy) Vamos  
Land Acquisition Agent  

Attachment