MEETING NOTICE

THERE WILL BE A MEETING OF THE
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 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 July 9, 2002
5. Chairman’s Report
   - Report on meeting held on July 30th with Sean Fahey, Jeff Viohl, and Beth Compton – Governor’s staff
6. Executive Director’s Report
   - Burr Street/city of Gary funding meeting held with Mayor King on July 19th
   - Update – Project Mitigation Status
     - In-project mitigation re-bid process
     - Hobart Marsh mitigation lands
   - Report on Trust for Public Land
7. Old Business
   - Report on property liability insurance update and Directors’ & Officers’ Liability insurance
   - Federal Highway credits update
8. Standing Committees

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

**Land Acquisition**
- Appraisals, offers, acquisitions, recommended actions
- Report on Committee meeting held 7/30/02

**Land Management**
- Award of mowing contract
- Approval of agreement with town of Highland for pump station turnover
- Update on property leases - Action
- Other issues

B. Project Engineering Committee – Bob Huffman, Chairman

- INDOT response to Tri-state drainage issue
- Update on Stage III Remediation Project
- Other Issues

C. Legislative Committee – George Carlson, Chairman

- Strategy for 2003-04 State Legislative session – Budget request
- Issues

D. Recreational Development Committee – Emerson Delaney, Chairman

- No recreational work scheduled until Recreation Phase 2 is released
- On 7/11/02 LCRBDC made Gary trail system inspection

E. Marina Development Committee – Bill Tanke, Chairman

- Report on BANK ONE meeting held re: marina revenue bonding for build-out of marina slips. Meeting held July 10th
- Other issues

F. Finance Committee – Curt Vosti, Chairman

- Financial status report
- Approval of claims for July 2002
- Other Issues

G. Environmental Committee – Mark Reshkin, Chairman

- Committee meeting to be held week of August 12th w/IDNR, IDEM, COE, LEL, & LCRBDC
- Other Issues

H. Policy Committee – George Carlson, Chairman

- Issues

I. Public Relations Committee – Bob Marszalek, Chairman

- Issues

9. Other Issues
10. New Business
11. Statements to the Board from the Floor
12. Set date for next meeting
MINUTES OF THE LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
HELD AT 6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, JULY 9, 2002
6100 SOUTHPORT ROAD
PORTAGE, INDIANA

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

Development Commissioners:
William Tanke
George Carlson
Mark Reshkin
Bob Marszalek
Steve Davis
Emerson Delaney
Robert Huffman

Visitors:
Liz McCloskey, Fish & Wildlife, IDNR
JoMary Crary, IDNR, Div. of Water
Don Ewoldt – Lake Erie Land
Imad Samara - ACOE
Sandy O’Brien - Hobart
Jim Flora – R.W. ARMSTRONG CO.
Mark Lopez – Congressman Visclosky’s Office

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

The minutes of the June 6th meeting were approved by a motion from Bob Marszalek; motion seconded by Steve Davis; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman’s Report – Chairman Tanke referred to the retreat meeting held last Friday where discussion centered on target spending for remaining state dollars available to us; discussion of the Burr Street Betterment levee; the upcoming meeting scheduled with Mayor King; project mitigation process; west reach public communications; O&M; Portage Public Marina; etc.
• Mr. Tanke also mentioned that a meeting is scheduled tomorrow (July 10th) with Bank One to discuss Commission financing with revenue bonding for the build-out of the marina.

Executive Director’s Report – Executive Director Dan Gardner reported that a half-hour meeting is scheduled with Mayor King at 11:00 Friday, July 19th. He referred to a map identifying differences in flooding area before and after the Burr Street Phase 2 project is complete. The COE will be present. The Commission does not have the funds to build Phase 2 at Burr Street due to Burr Street costs not being creditable and the $2.5 million that was recalled to fund the State deficit.
• Discussion was held on the in-project mitigation contract. Imad informed the Board members that the contract has to be re-bid. Advance notice went out a week ago last Monday. Bids probably will be in by July 18-19.
• Mr. Gardner referred to the letter dated July 9, 2002 from Jay DuMontelle from FHWA regarding highway credit. He is still pursuing it and said he needed about 3 more weeks. Hopefully, we will hear something before the next Commission meeting.
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• Mr. Gardner referred to the news article on the groundbreaking of the south leg of the IL Deep Tunnel project. He has been in contact with Frank Gaweda, Metropolitan Water Reclamation District, and he has offered to come before the Board and talk about the IL project. He also offered to show us the project sometime if we would be interested. They are using the Thornton Quarry (east of Halsted) as a large reservoir to hold rain waters. Mr. Gardner will follow up and invite Mr. Gaweda to the next Commission meeting.

Old Business – Regarding the drainage ditch area that lies between Colfax and Calhoun, north of the Norfolk Southern RR, Mr. Gardner stated that we have responded to the homeowners’ petition and we will work with them for a mutual satisfaction. The COE has agreed to clean out the ditch in an upcoming contract.

• Attorney Lou Casale stated that we have met the required steps before proceeding to dispose of excess property and the initial property that we would like to sell is the rental house located at 3120 Gerry Street. The current renters living there have expressed an interest in purchasing it. An appraisal has been performed in the amount of $36,000. Mark Reskin made a motion to offer the house to the present renters at the appraised price and if they do not wish to purchase it, it will be advertised; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.

• In regard to the INDOT project at Indianapolis Blvd. and the Tri State, no consensus has been agreed to in pursuing a pump station in that immediate area. There appears to be some renewed interest but INDOT may be too far along in their planning to change course at this point in time. We have written to INDOT but have not received a response yet. Jim Pokrajac has been in contact with John Bach, Highland Public Works Director, and they are going to look into some drainage issues there to improve the flooding situation. Neither the COE or the Commission has seen the INDOT plans.

• Regarding the property liability insurance, Lou Casale stated that he has been in contact with the insurance company and has been assured that they are working with underwriters in obtaining some quotes from them for increased insurance coverage. We should be getting quotes back soon and he will have a report for the next meeting. Chairman Tanke asked whether he is also checking into increasing the Directors & Officers Liability insurance also. Attorney Casale hopes to have this information shortly and he will report back at the next meeting.

Land Acquisition/Management Committee – In Committee Chairperson Arlene Colvin’s absence, Bob Marszalek gave the report. He informed the Board that staff is working with the Pittsburgh District appraiser reviewer since there is no reviewer at the Chicago district office. We have received approval of the crediting appraisal for the 200 acre farm at a value of $345,000. Mr. Casale added that property purchased prior to the 1st construction contract must be reappraised at the time of the 1st contract.

• Continuing efforts are being made in regard to the mitigation land in the Hobart Marsh area. There was discussion that one property owner may donate her property if a memorial could be built on it to honor her deceased father. It was also pointed out that the owner may be contacting other entities with the same request. Staff will pursue.

• Mr. Marszalek reported that a Land Acquisition/Management committee meeting was held on June 10th. One of the main reasons for the meeting was to discuss how to pursue the completion of the Charles Agnew Handicapped Park. Mr. Marszalek felt that a commitment had been made at a public meeting and plans are in place but the project is at a stand still. He would like to meet with LEL to discuss this. Staff will schedule a follow-up meeting in which LEL will be invited.
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• After a discussion on the mowing of the levees, Bob Marszalek made a motion for staff to obtain 3 quotes and come back to the Board at the August meeting for selection of a contractor to do the mowing; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously. Emerson Delaney asked whether staff could go ahead and contract with the lowest and best price before the next meeting and then have it ratified at the meeting; attorney Casale said that it should come back before the Board.
• Property leases were discussed. Regarding the Village Shopping Center, the attorney has been in contact with the new owners who have requested proof of ownership from us. Lou will follow up. The leases will be discussed at the upcoming Land Acquisition/Management meeting.

Project Engineering Committee – Committee Chairman Bob Huffman gave the engineering report. He reported that the 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. A replacement has been hired for Larry McClelland and it appears that the Surveyor’s office has stated that they will do the drainage easement survey for us. We will pursue trying to get this done as soon as possible.
• Mr. Huffman reported that union concerns have been addressed and picketing has ceased for the pump station 1B project in Highland.
• Discussion ensued on the Project Business Process Tracking Plan. Staff has made some modifications and additions. It is not in final form yet but the agenda packet contains the latest version. We will work with the COE to finalize.
• Mr. Huffman referred to the minutes of the Gary Sanitary District meeting held on June 6th.
• Mr. Huffman referred to the Utility Coordination meetings held on June 12 and June 25 and indicated that procedures were finalized.

Legislative Committee – Committee Chairman George Carlson reported that he felt the immediate budget crisis was over now that the Governor and the legislators have reached a compromise. Mr. Carlson went on to highlight some of the tax increases that would take effect offset by the reduction in local real estate and property taxes. Mr. Gardner added that he called the State Budget Agency about the return of the $2.5 million that was rescinded from the last biennium. He talked to Mike Landwer, Deputy Budget Director, who informed him that the Build IN funds will be used to meet the General Budget shortfall and although it would not be returned, it will “stay on the books”. New BIF money would be needed to be deducted to replenish the fund.
• Mr. Gardner referred to the chart on the update of total monies spent in regard to the “budget” staff had developed for priority spending with the remaining funds on hand. We will continue to track expenditures by category and update it each month for the meeting. When asked whether our funds will take us through to the next biennium, Mr. Gardner stated that he thought they would if we stick to the plan. A budget request will be sent out in mid August, which is several months later than in the past. Mark Reshkin inquired whether we had the ability to obtain funds from the Governor’s budget and not out of Build IN funds. Discussion ensued on whether we should pursue this with Representative Earl Harris. Chairman Bill Tanke asked Legislative committee chairman George Carlson if his committee could meet and devise a strategy for a legislative approach before the next session.

Recreational Development Committee – Committee Chairman Emerson Delaney stated that there are no recreation contracts at this time.
• Jim Pokrajac added that he had sent an email to Imad regarding the cantilevered walkway at Kennedy Avenue in Highland. R. W. Armstrong had done a feasibility study for us a while back. Emerson Delaney
asked Imad if engineering would be costly. Imad responded he thought not; we can look at some alternatives; it will be handled when we continue with design on Stage VI-1 (& V-2) and it will be addressed then.

**Marina Committee** – Committee Chairman Bill Tanke stated that a meeting is set up for tomorrow (July 10) with Bank One to see if we can secure funds through revenue bonding for the build-out of required additional slips at the marina. He also stated that we have received an updated expense and income sheet from the city of Portage.

**Finance/Policy Committee** – In Committee Chairman Curt Vosti’s absence, Dan Gardner gave the Finance report. He presented the financial statement and the claim sheet for June with total claims being $68,087.98. Bob Marszalek made a motion to approve the claims as presented; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion passed unanimously.  
* Mr. Gardner then referred to the COE letter stating they were withdrawing $100,000 from the construction escrow account.

**Environmental Committee** – Committee Chairman Mark Reshkin gave the Environmental Report. He referred to the COE letter on using land within the corridor for hydric soils. At the last meeting, he had asked for the attorney’s opinion on the legality of the letter. Attorney Casale commented that the letter assumes that the license agreement is in effect with LEL, which, in fact, we only have an option with them. Discussion ensued on how the mitigation plan originated and if all agencies were in agreement on the path we are taking in seeking lands in Hobart Marsh. Dr. Reshkin said he would like a meeting with all parties present so he and everyone else can feel 100% confident in the plan. Imad stated that IDEM and IDNR are in agreement with the plan and offered his technical people to meet with the Environmental committee at any time. Mr. Gardner added that we are proceeding. Surveys are being conducted; appraisers are on board and contact has been made with some of the property owners in Hobart Marsh. A meeting will be scheduled in which IDNR, IDEM, COE, LEL and any interested Commission members.

**Policy Committee** – Committee Chairman George Carlson referred to the adopted bylaws that were distributed. Although they have been approved by the members, he has a problem with “6 members constitute a quorum. A majority vote is needed”. He feels that since a majority vote of 6 members is 4, it is not enough members to reflect a fair vote, since the Commission has 11 members total. He said he would like to contact Senator Frank Mrvan to obtain a ruling from the Attorney General’s office in regard to this language. Although Attorney Casale assured him that our statute clearly states that 6 members constitute a quorum and a majority vote is needed, he had no objection to Mr. Carlson pursuing it. He will report back.  
* Bob Huffman stated he thought that the approved maximum amounts for contracts should be included in the bylaws. Attorney Casale said it should not be in the bylaws and that it was more of an operational item. Steve Davis added that the bylaws are more like rules of operation and perhaps we need to go a step further and create “rules of procedure” in which other kind of business matters that we have adopted in the past can be incorporated so that a new member will have everything spelled out.  
* Attorney Casale stated that he did send the bylaws to the State Board of Accounts.

**Public Relations Committee** – Committee Chairman Bob Marszalek stated that he went on line and printed out what the COE web site and what the library web site had on the LCRBDC. He distributed copies.
Other Issues — Chairman Bill Tanke initiated a discussion on whether the Commission should attend the NAFSMA (National Association of Flood and Storm Water Management Agency) to be held September 10-13 this year. George Carlson made a motion that 1 person be sent; motion seconded by Bob Huffman; motion died for lack of majority vote. Chairman Tanke felt the conference is a valuable working tool to interact with other agencies with the same problems we have and recommended that all members plus the Executive Director be given the opportunity to attend (additional staff and contract employees would have to be voted on separately by the Board). Emerson Delaney recommended that maybe just the officers should attend. Bob Marszalek suggested that perhaps the Commission member could pay part of the expense out of his own pocket. Several Commissioners stated that they would not plan to attend anyway. After a lengthy discussion, Bob Huffman made a motion to send a total of 2 people, with the Chairman and Executive Director each choosing 1; it could be themselves or they could designate 1 other; motion was seconded by Emerson Delaney; motion passed with 5 yes and 2 opposed (opposing votes were Steve Davis and Bob Marszalek).

New Business — Mr. Gardner referred to the letter dated May 31, 2002 from the COE addressed to Don Vonnahme, Director of Water Resources, IL Dept. of Natural Resources, regarding their concern about the relationship between their agency and the Development Commission in the timing of the flood control projects. After discussion, it was stated that Dan Gardner would coordinate with Imad Samara to meet with the state of Illinois to discuss the coordination at the State line.

Statements to the Board — Sandy O'Brien expressed concern over the acquiring of properties for mitigation and suggested we meet with Trust for Public Lands, an agency who has money to purchase lands at appraised value and then hold them in their name until we would have the funds to purchase the property from them for the appraised value. As a member of the public, she requested that we at least look into it and address the request in a letter to the Chairman. The Chairman asked staff to look into it and report back.

- Don Ewoldt questioned the COE’s solicitation for the in-project mitigation contract. He says they are advertising lands that LEL has an option on and they do not have a right-of-entry from LEL to do that. Staff will check with the COE to make sure they are advertising lands that are covered in the ROE. Mr. Ewoldt added that he has not seen anything signed by IDNR or IDEM as to their approval with the mitigation plan. Mark Reshkin invited Mr. Ewoldt to the mitigation meeting when it is scheduled.

- Liz McCloskey, IDNR Fish & Wildlife, commented that she has followed this project on and off since 1978 when the river flowed west. Mr. Delaney added that the river flows east and west once it receives more than 1" of water.

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, August 1st at 6:00 p.m.

/sjm
City of Gary Meeting
Burr Street Levee Completion
July 19, 2002

AGENDA

I. What Has Been Done to Date
   - Federal Dollars Spent - +$ 66,000,000
   - State Dollars Spent - + $16,500,000
   - Levees and Recreation Features completed from Burr Street to I-65

II. What Remains to be Done in Gary
BURR STREET LEVEE STAGE II
   - Non Federal $'s Needed
     - $180,000 – Land Acquisition
     - $100,000 – Utility Relocation
     - $1,900,000 – Cash toward contract
   - Federal construction total $3.6 million
   - Once funding is committed, FEMA can be petitioned to begin removing Gary from the floodplain.

III. The Dilemma
   - State Budget Director/Governor's office has taken $2.5 million from 2001-03 appropriation for General fund budget shortfall
   - State Budget Director/Governor's office has restricted use of Development Commission funds for creditable items only. Burr Street is classified as a betterment.
AGENDA

LAND ACQUISITION / MANAGEMENT MEETING

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2002, 9 AM

1.) CHARLES AGNEW PARK COMMITMENTS
   a. Completion of the playground adjacent to River Forest Elementary.
   b. Completion of the fieldhouse.

2.) LEASE AGREEMENTS
   a. Berkheimer’s
   b. Chase Street Farm Stand
   c. Village Shopping Center
      * Discuss current lease & options.
      * Appraisal needed to sell, rent, or increase rent
      * Status of the $15,000 in back rent. New agreement needed?

3.) OPERATION AGREEMENTS
   a. Highland Pump Station Turnover Agreement.
**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**  
**JANUARY 1, 2002 - JUNE 30, 2002**

### Cash Position - January 1, 2002

**Checking Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>1,716,775.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Receipts - January 1, 2002 - June 30, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease Rent</td>
<td>26,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income/From Checking &amp; First Natl</td>
<td>14,835.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>373,822.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest</td>
<td>396.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Income</td>
<td>911.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRCB Reimbursement Re: Telephone Charge</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds From Voided Checks</td>
<td>418,166.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM7254 M. NIMISTZ</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Administrative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Expenses Paid in 2002</td>
<td>94,595.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DHM</td>
<td>3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>5,385.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRPC</td>
<td>69,719.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Mileage</td>
<td>705.12</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>3,180.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Expense</td>
<td>1,052.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>41,117.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>21,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Services</td>
<td>41,578.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
<td>22,525.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Purchase Contractual</td>
<td>2,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Project Maintenance Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Services</td>
<td>1,700.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveying Services</td>
<td>7,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic/Marketing Sources</td>
<td>18,864.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Structure Costs</td>
<td>6,251.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Allocation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>6,505.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Structures Insurance</td>
<td>345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation Services</td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Capital Improvement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Capital Improvements</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges Mercantile</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCRBDC Money Market Payback</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td><strong>453,822.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Position - June 30, 2002

**Checking Account**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>65,254.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>85,398.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Fund</td>
<td>417.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank</td>
<td>700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Basis Capital Investment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank</td>
<td>258,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(misc Interestential Investment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td>1,661,498.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow Account Interest Available</td>
<td>407.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,812,648.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
## MONTHLY BUDGET REPORT, JULY 2002

### 6 MONTH ALLOCATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>10,038.82</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</strong></td>
<td>205.56</td>
<td>15.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>5,993.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>44,727.87</td>
<td>4,043,460.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12 MONTH ALLOCATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>4,250.00</td>
<td>11,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>6,943.81</td>
<td>1,556.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>70,183.37</td>
<td>54,816.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</strong></td>
<td>861.64</td>
<td>13,138.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</strong></td>
<td>591.80</td>
<td>4,408.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>2,130.82</td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>1,032.45</td>
<td>6,967.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>41,961.07</td>
<td>83,038.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>239,652.83</td>
<td>260,347.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</strong></td>
<td>37,466.29</td>
<td>3,132,721.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</strong></td>
<td>26,178.50</td>
<td>1,821.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</strong></td>
<td>65,501.24</td>
<td>134,498.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>247,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</strong></td>
<td>507.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>503,332.32</td>
<td>3,982,855.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monthly Budget Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>ALLOCATED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ALLOCATED</th>
<th>BUDGETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5801 PER DIEM EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>4,150.00</td>
<td>11,850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5811 LEGAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
<td>1,102.33</td>
<td>670.33</td>
<td>1,522.33</td>
<td>337.33</td>
<td>1,318.33</td>
<td>1,295.83</td>
<td>6,246.48</td>
<td>2,253.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5812 NIRPC SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>9,166.68</td>
<td>9,877.00</td>
<td>9,953.97</td>
<td>11,083.65</td>
<td>10,038.82</td>
<td>10,175.62</td>
<td>60,295.74</td>
<td>64,704.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5821 TRAVEL/MILEAGE</strong></td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>153.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>205.56</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>355.88</td>
<td>730.60</td>
<td>13,269.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5822 PRINTING/ADVERTISING</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>465.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,477.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5823 BONDS/INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,993.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,070.75</td>
<td>1,429.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5824 TELEPHONE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>356.03</td>
<td>391.21</td>
<td>554.13</td>
<td>365.78</td>
<td>159.44</td>
<td>304.23</td>
<td>2,130.82</td>
<td>4,869.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5825 MEETING EXPENSES</strong></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>832.29</td>
<td>1,005.20</td>
<td>6,994.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5838 LEGAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>7,875.89</td>
<td>6,320.57</td>
<td>6,146.94</td>
<td>8,282.77</td>
<td>5,205.87</td>
<td>4,287.43</td>
<td>38,119.47</td>
<td>86,880.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5840 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>24,865.61</td>
<td>39,996.25</td>
<td>31,588.45</td>
<td>28,835.44</td>
<td>35,610.73</td>
<td>46,326.16</td>
<td>207,222.64</td>
<td>292,777.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5860 PROJECT LAND PURCHASE EXP.</strong></td>
<td>2,275.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,800.00</td>
<td>5,133.74</td>
<td>14,071.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,280.09</td>
<td>3,143,907.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5881 PROPERTY/STRUCTURE INS.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,210.50</td>
<td>1,968.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5882 UTILITY RELOCATION EXP.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62,507.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>760.54</td>
<td>63,267.54</td>
<td>136,732.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5883 PROJECT LAND CAP. IMPROV.</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5884 STRUCTURES CAP. IMPROV.</strong></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>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.75</td>
<td>24,492.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,486,188.00</td>
<td>46,638.31</td>
<td>57,389.03</td>
<td>55,031.44</td>
<td>147,177.35</td>
<td>68,403.76</td>
<td>68,087.98</td>
<td>442,727.87</td>
<td>4,043,460.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table entries are in USD. The budget and allocated amounts are for the months of July, August, September, October, November, and December.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT</th>
<th>VENDOR NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>EXPLANATION OF CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5601</td>
<td>BILL TANKE</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>PER DIEM FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002 (ADD'L DATES ADDED ON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5611</td>
<td>CASALE WOODWARD BULS, LLP</td>
<td>233.33</td>
<td>RETAINER FEE BILLED FOR MONTH OF JULY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5611</td>
<td>CASALE WOODWARD BULS, LLP</td>
<td>414.00</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL LEGAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 7/18/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5612</td>
<td>NIRPC</td>
<td>9,842.14</td>
<td>SERVICES PERFORMED JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5612</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>OVERNIGHT MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5612</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>OVERNIGHT MAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5621</td>
<td>GEORGE CARLSON</td>
<td>42.58</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5621</td>
<td>MARK RESHKIN</td>
<td>62.72</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR PERIOD JAN THRU JUNE 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5621</td>
<td>BILL TANKE</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>MILEAGE FOR APRIL 1 &amp; APRIL 11, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5622</td>
<td>TREASURER OF STATE OF INDIANA</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>COST OF BOOK &quot;ROSTER OF STATE &amp; LOCAL OFFICIALS&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5622</td>
<td>JIM POKRAJAC</td>
<td>32.98</td>
<td>FILM PROCESSING FOR PICTURES OF TRAIL SEGMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5622</td>
<td>JIM POKRAJAC</td>
<td>26.53</td>
<td>PURCHASE OF FILM FOR PICTURES OF TRAIL SEGMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5625</td>
<td>SAND RIDGE BANK</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>MEETING EXPENSES REGARDING MEETING WITH MAYOR KING TO DISCUSS FUNDING OF BURR ST LEVEE, PHASE II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5638</td>
<td>LOUIS CASALE</td>
<td>3,841.60</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/LEGAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 7/18/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED PROPERTY COUNSELORS LTD</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED PROPERTY COUNSELORS LTD</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1010-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED PROPERTY COUNSELORS LTD</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1025, DC-1031, DC-1042, DC-1044, DC-1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>ASSOCIATED PROPERTY COUNSELORS LTD</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL FEE FOR DC-1049, DC-1045, DC-1020, DC-1009, DC-1043, DC-1007, DC-1006, DC-1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5641</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL SERVICES LLC</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICES FOR DC-88 &amp; DC-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5642</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>4,479.81</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 7/19/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-117A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-118A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-119B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-118C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-118F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>MERIDIAN TITLE CORPORATION-LAPORTE</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-146A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>INDIANA TITLE NETWORK COMPANY</td>
<td>270.00</td>
<td>TITLE WORK PREFORMED FOR DC-164A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5643</td>
<td>AREA PLUMBING &amp; SEWER</td>
<td>3,742.00</td>
<td>COSTS INCURRED RE. DC-448 PROPERTY CLEANUP DUE TO LEVEE CONSTRUCTION STAGE IV-IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5644</td>
<td>JAMES E. POKRAJAC</td>
<td>4,050.00</td>
<td>ENGINEERING/LAND MANAGEMENT SERVICES 7/1/02-7/15/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5644</td>
<td>JUDITH VAMOS</td>
<td>3,029.50</td>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION/MANAGEMENT SERVICES 7/1/02-7/15/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5644</td>
<td>G. LORRAINE KRAY</td>
<td>739.13</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN/LAND ACQUISITION ASST 7/1/02-7/15/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5644</td>
<td>SANDY MORDUS</td>
<td>232.75</td>
<td>CREDITING TECHNICIAN SERVICES 7/1/02-7/15/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5651</td>
<td>J. EDWARD &amp; MONICA A. JOHNSTON</td>
<td>9,685.20</td>
<td>UNIFORM EASEMENT ACQUISITION FOR DC-483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5681</td>
<td>AMANDA NORRIS</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE OF TEMPORARY EASEMENT FOR DC-1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5682</td>
<td>ELGIN JOLIET &amp; EASTERN RWY</td>
<td>2,005.70</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION COSTS INCURRED AT SIV-IS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5682</td>
<td>R. W. ARMSTRONG</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES FOR PERIOD ENDED 7/19/2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 60,604.45
PROJECT ENGINEERING
MONTHLY STATUS REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, August 1, 2002
(Information in this report is from June 27, 2002 – July 25, 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 REMEDIATION PLAN.
1. COE estimates approx. $1 million to do this work. $800,000 for ditches and pumps,
   $50,000 to engineer an 18,500 GPM pump station West of Grant St. & 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. Extending the combination sewer East of Grant Street, North to our line of protection
3. Tentative schedule is to advertise in late 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.
   • Received an e-mail from Marathon on June 24th with several questions that need to be
     addressed prior to their approval.
   • We received a response from the COE on July 10th that they were addressing these
     Marathon concerns and we would be receiving sets of the bid documents when
     advertised.

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. 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.
3. 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.
   • 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:**
   - The COE anticipates repairing levee damage no later than the end of **August, 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.
      - A follow-up e-mail was sent to Carmen Wilson (GSD Director) on July 12th requesting coordination for the inspection.

**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. *(On-going)*

**STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 1) E.J. & E. Railroad to, and including Colfax North of the NIPSCO R/W (Drainage from Arborgast 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) 1/2 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.
   - A meeting was held with Mayor King on July 19th to review current construction status of our overall project in Gary, present the LCRBDC dilemma with crediting and funding, and discuss if Gary could help us in any way.
3. The LCRBDC received modified information from the COE in July, 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.
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. 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”.
      • We received a letter from INDOT on July 17th in response to our request. They presented their
         current schedule and indicated that if they would modify their contract that we would delay this project by 3-4 months.

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. (Refer to the COE/LCRBDC Coordination Report)
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. A conference call was held with the COE, LCRBDC, and RANI Engineering on July 17 to review final engineering decisions, real estate, utilities, and recreation for VI-2.
   - RANI said they could complete real estate (2) weeks after they receive final information from COE. COE anticipates (3) weeks. This would be approximately August 25.

**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 August 2, 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 Hohman Avenue bridge project is approximately 90% complete and the Lake County Highway Dept. anticipates the road being opened no later than August 2, 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.

**West Reach Pump Stations – Phase 1A:**
1. The four (4) pump stations that are included in this initial West Reach pump station project are Baring, Walnut, S. Kennedy, and Hohman/Munster.
2. Low bidder was Overstreet Construction. Notice to proceed was given on November 7th, 2000 – 700 work days to complete (Oct. 2002)
• We received an “add to” the contract from the COE on July 1, 2002 in the amount of $29,000 to replace a pump seal at the Hohman/Munster pump station.
  • Current contract amount - $4,743,172
  • Original contract amount - $4,638,400.00
  • Amount overrun – $104,772 (2.3%)


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 potable water line.

**Walnut Pump Station**
• 43% complete
• 3 pumps have been re-built and are ready for testing. *(These need new impellers)*
• Electric installation ongoing.
• Mechanical trash rack being stored on site.

**S. Kennedy Pump Station**
• 39% complete
• One pump has been re-built and is being factory tested.
• Concrete discharge box modifications ongoing.
• New flap gates have been installed and part of the 8” discharge pipe has been removed.
• **Mechanical trash rack removed. Pad for new rack is being modified.**

**Hohman/Munster Pump Station**
• 50% complete
• Electric installation 90% complete
• 2 pumps installed and ready for operation
• 2 additional pumps received have been installed *(can be used as standbys)*
• All new pumps and motors have been received and are in storage

5. We received the last status report from the COE on **July 22, 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. A final inspection was held for both stations on September 18th, 2001. We received a letter that day listing key turnover items.
2. Thieneman Construction from Griffith, IN was the successful bidder.
• Current contract amount - $2,120,730.12
• Original contract amount - $1,963,400.00
• Amount overrun - $157,330 (9%)
3. We received the last status report from the COE on **July 22, 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 45% completed

2. There are currently 10 pumps and all of these will be replaced with new and will be coordinated with the Town of Highland.
   - All pumps and motors have been delivered and are currently being stored on the job site.

3. We received the last status report from the COE on July 22, 2002

4. (4) pumps and motors have been removed.
   - Flap gates have been installed

GENERAL:

1. Minority Participation - We received an e-mail from Commissioner Huffman on April 29th, 2002, addressing some concerns with the monthly report.
   A. We received this modified format (abbreviated and simplified) and presented it to the LCRBDC at the July 9th public meeting. It met the request we wanted.
      - A letter was sent to the COE on July 23rd requesting this format as a supplement to the regular reports.

2. LCRBDC comprised a list of completed construction contract costs and utility relocation costs, to date, for the city of Gary. Combined, they total over $42 million and were available to Mayor King in our meeting of July 29, 2002.
Sandy Mordus

From: "Samara, Imad LRC" <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
To: "Little Calumet" <littlecal@nirpc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2002 3:53 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Drainage Structure over MAPL's 6" pipeline near Grant St., Gary, IN

Jim Khalfid is busy with couple of things on the project I will try to get him to get you something on this by next week. I'm sorry for this delay.

Imad N. Samara
Project Manager
111 N Canal Street
Chicago, IL 60606
312-353-8400 Ext 1809
Fax: 312-353-4256

-----Original Message-----
From: Little Calumet [mailto:littlecal@nirpc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2002 3:34 PM
To: Samara, Imad LRC
Subject: Fw: Proposed Drainage Structure over MAPL's 6" pipeline near Grant St., Gary, IN

Imad:

I received the following e-mail from Marathon on July 8th asking when you will respond to the previous Marathon questions as well as coming up with some type of construction schedule. Marathon needs to have these questions answered and need to know when construction will begin so they can coordinate internally.

In my conversation with Marathon on July 9th, Mr. Woodsmall indicated that they would need to have a Marathon inspector on the site during the time when all excavation and installation work are ongoing over their pipeline. We anticipate a cost of several thousand dollars and we intend on getting an agreement with Marathon to compensate them for their time. Will you please let me know that this will be a creditable cost to the Development Commission.

Jim Pokrajac
----- Original Message -----
From: Woodsmall, D L (David)
To: Little Calumet
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2002 7:17 PM
Subject: RE: Proposed Drainage Structure over MAPL's 6" pipeline near Grant St., Gary, IN

Jim - Any idea when there will be a response to the questions and when will construction begin? I'm trying to do some planning and will need to line up an inspector.

David Woodsmall
Marathon Ashland Petroleum
219/477-4001

-----Original Message-----
From: Little Calumet [mailto:littlecal@nirpc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2002 9:51 AM
To: Samara, Imad LRC; Woodsmall, D L (David)
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: littlecal@nirpc.org 
Cc: Donnelly, Jeffrey A.; Strabley, 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

7/10/2002
Sandy Mordus

From: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
To: <carmen@garysan.com>
Cc: <Edmund.J.Karwatka@lrc02.usace.army.mil>; <dsmales@greeley-hansen.com>; "Samara, Imad LRC* <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2002 11:46 AM
Subject: Burr Street Pump Station Auxiliary Pump Station

Carmen:

In reference to the e-mail I sent you on June 28th regarding an inspection for the auxiliary power hookup at the North Burr Street pump station, I would like to coordinate a day and a time to do our final inspection/informational visit on the site. I realize in the past couple of weeks that you have tried to contact me, and I have tried to contact you, but we have had no success. Could you please try calling me at 219/763-0696 or sending me an e-mail with several dates that would be good for you and/or appropriate representatives. At that point, I will facilitate with the ACOE to line up this meeting and contact you accordingly. Thank you for attention to this matter.

Jim Pokrajac
City of Gary Meeting
Burr Street Levee Completion
July 19, 2002

AGENDA

I. What Has Been Done to Date
   • Federal Dollars Spent - +$ 66,000,000
   • State Dollars Spent - + $16,500,000
   • Levees and Recreation Features completed from Burr Street to I-65

II. What Remains to Be Done in Gary
    BURR STREET LEVEE STAGE II
   • Non Federal $’s Needed
     ➢ $130,000 – Land Acquisition
     ➢ $100,000 – Utility Relocation
     ➢ $1,900,000 – Cash toward contract
   • Federal construction total $3.6 million
   • Once funding is committed, FEMA can be petitioned to begin removing Gary from the floodplain.

III. The Dilemma
   • State Budget Director/Governor’s office has taken $2.5 million from 2001-03 appropriation for General fund budget shortfall
   • State Budget Director/Governor’s office has restricted use of Development Commission funds for creditable items only. Burr Street is classified as a betterment.
Mr. Dan Gardner 7/17/02  
Executive Director of  
The Little River Basin Development Commission  
6100 Southport Road  
Portage Indiana 46368  

Dear Dan,  
On June 20th, you sent a letter (attached) requesting me to double check the possibility of still adding a group pump station to the Phase I contract on US 41. Currently, that contract is scheduled for  
Plans signed  12/5/02  
Ready for Letting  12/15/02  
Letting  3/25/03  
I requested that the design consultant give me a detailed time frame of what he thought it would take to accomplish this task. Here is his best guess;  

A. The following is the proposed schedule for the "INDOT" Lift Station:  

Survey:  
We have submitted our request for the additional survey. We are hoping to receive this information on or before July 31, 2002. The proposed design schedule is based on this assumption.  

Schedule:  
Survey Complete  7/31/02  
Survey Check / Supplement as needed  8/15/02  
70% Design Completion for Permits  10/15/02  
100% Design Complete  12/1/02  

Permits:  
US Army Corps Regional General Permit  5 days  
IDEM Regional Permit  15 days  
Possible IDNR Construction in a Floodway Permit  4 months?
We will not know if a DNR permit will be required at this time. If our proposed lift station is in an area where the new Corps levee has been constructed, it might not be necessary. We will try to coordinate with IDNR to make this determination prior to submittal of the design plans and permit documents.

We will not know if some minor additional R/W would be required at this time. We cannot make this determination until the design of the lift station. It appears there is adequate room to construct it but it’s difficult to determine without the size of the lift station.

B. Proposed schedule for the “Group” Lift Station:

Two primary issues will affect the schedule for the group lift station:

1. Data Gathering: With the group lift station, additional mapping, planning, negotiations, meeting coordination, possible aerial mapping and contouring would be needed. Just this portion of the schedule would be affected by 90 to 120 days on top of the above mentioned schedule.

2. Additional R/W and/or Drainage Easement: The group lift station will most likely be constructed west of the US 41 bridge over Little Calumet River at the old abandoned railroad R/W. Because of the time required to gather the data, R/W plans for this portion will probably not be available until 11/1/02. R/W Engineering, Appraising and Buying will then follow.

R/W is the main obstacle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans to R/W</td>
<td>11/1/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracting</td>
<td>1/1/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraising</td>
<td>3/1/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying</td>
<td>4/1/03 to 6/1/03 (add 12 months if either parcel is condemned. We have had to condemn 40% of all the parcels on 41 in this area, and one of the property owners we’re dealing with for this has already been condemned. Therefore it’s safe to assume we would be in condemnation all over again.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R/W would probably move this project out to a 2004 or 2005 construction season.
We are currently looking for a 2003 construction season.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John Wright, P.E.
INDOT CPG Group Manager

Cc Ron Adams
Hasmukh Patel / JSE
Allen Egilmez / United
MEMORANDUM FOR (SEE DISTRIBUTION)

SUBJECT: Contract No. DACW27-01-C-0001
Little Calumet River
Pump Stations Rehabilitation, Phase 1A
Hammond Sanitary District
Lake County, Indiana
Modification No. A00005 - Executed

1. Enclosed is a copy of all pertinent information related to executed Modification No. A00005 as it pertains to the above subject contract.

2. Any questions concerning the enclosed items shall be directed to Robert B. Smolar at (219) 923-1763/64.

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

DISTRIBUTION:
CELRC-CO-S (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CO-C (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-CT (Complete Mod. File)
CELRC-FM-M (Mod. Only) I. Samara
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) R. Craib
CELRC-CO-S (Mod. Only) R. Smolar
LCRBDC (Mod. Only) J. Pokrajac
CHICAGO DISTRICT
111 North Canal Street
Suite 500
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

USAED, Chicago (CO-S)
Calumet Area Office
906 Griffith Boulevard
Griffith, IN 46319

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

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

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

ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA
See Page 2.
Contract Amount Increased $29,000.00.

THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO AMPENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

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

A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify Authority)

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

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

D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

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

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

Contract for Pump Station Rehabilitation, Phase 1A at Little Calumet River, Indiana.
Reference No. R00013
SS013 Replace Seal Water Pump at Hohman
See Page 2.

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

NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)

THOMAS A. DEJA, P.E.
Administrative Contracting Officer

CONTRACTOR/ORDER

DATE SIGNED

United States of America

SIGNATURE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO SIGN

(21st UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-63)
PREVIOUS EDITION UNUSABLE

30-105-2

PRESIGNED BY CAA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BID ITEMS</th>
<th>COST CODE</th>
<th>CURRENT AMOUNT</th>
<th>PREVIOUS AMOUNT</th>
<th>OBLIGATED AMOUNT</th>
<th>AMOUNT THRU</th>
<th>MOD. NO.: A00005 (FC-01-14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>CONCRACT NO.: DACW27-01-C-0001 (PR&amp;C NO: W61G6893015179)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obligated</td>
<td>Obligated</td>
<td>Obligated</td>
<td>Obligated</td>
<td>LOCATION: LAKE COUNTY, INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Incl.</td>
<td>and Incl.</td>
<td>and Incl.</td>
<td>and Incl.</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR/ADDRESS: Overstreet Electric Co., Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>4220 N. Davis Hwy., Bldg. B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>Pensacola, FL 32503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td>($Incl. All)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>96X3122 / 99% FED</td>
<td>$4,411,149.95</td>
<td>$2,017,969.33</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,017,969.33</td>
<td>$2,393,180.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIG. LINE ITEM 1 0029B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,411,149.95</td>
<td>$2,017,969.33</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,017,969.33</td>
<td>$2,393,180.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>96X3862 / 7%</td>
<td>$332,022.04</td>
<td>$151,890.16</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$151,890.16</td>
<td>$160,131.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NON-FED OBLIG. LINE ITEM 1A 0029C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$332,022.04</td>
<td>$151,890.16</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$151,890.16</td>
<td>$160,131.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,743,171.99</td>
<td>$2,169,859.49</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$2,169,859.49</td>
<td>$2,573,312.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Progress Update: 7-22-02

Pump Rehab 1B Contract C-0035 (Thieneman Const.)
81st Station - 100% complete.

S.E. Hessville Station - 100% complete.

Pump Rehab 1A Contract C-0001 (Overstreet Electric Co.)
Baring Ave Pump Station - 17%+- Complete.
1. Two pumps and motors have been received and are being stored.
2. COE previously coordinated with City of Munster and the Hammond SD to determine who will be providing the potable water line (pump seal water) to this station. The Hammond Sanitary District has installed the new water service.
3. Discharge box modification work has been started.

South Kennedy Ave Pump Station - 39%+- Complete.
1. Viking Engineering continues to resolve issues regarding pump performance of rebuilt pump #5. A different impeller needs to be installed to meet the contract’s pump performance requirements. Delivery of a new impeller is expected on 7-24-02.
2. New motor control center (MCC) has been set in place. Electrical demolition of old and installation of new conduit and equipment is ongoing.
3. Concrete discharge box modifications continue.
4. Removal of the existing mechanical trash rack is complete. The existing concrete pad for the new trash rack is being modified to accommodate the new trash rack. The new mechanical trash is stored on site.

Hohman/Munster Pump Station- 50%+- Complete.
1. Startup/turnover of the new SWP-2 took place on 6-7-02. The old SWP-1 removal operation is complete. New concrete pump and pipe supports are being installed.
2. Two standby pumps are installed and ready for operation, if needed.
3. A portion of ventilation ductwork has been removed and a portion of new ductwork continues to be installed.

Walnut Ave. Pump Station - 43%+- 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. Viking has contacted Yoemans Pump Co. to procure the required impellers.
2. Discharge box modification work continues.
3. A new mechanical trash rack is being stored on site.

North 5th Pump Station Rehab Contract C-0008 (Overstreet Engineering & Const.)
N.5th. Pump Station - 45%+- Complete.
1. Sub contractor "Piping Technologies" has previously removed various pumps & motors. Pump #6 was recently removed and new pump #1 and #2 are being installed.
2. Exterior concrete work, above the discharge boxes, is almost complete.
3. New mechanical trash rack has been delivered and is stored on site.
July 23, 2002

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

Dear Tom:

Subject: Minority Participation revised format

In a recent conversation with Blair Smolar, he indicated to me that I should request, in writing, to have you provide an additional format for tracking minority participation that would be done in an "easy to read" simplified form. Blair had recently formatted this for the Pump Station 1A Contract (I enclosed a copy of this format) which was reviewed and met the criteria requested by our Commissioners. I would like to follow this same format with all ongoing contracts as well as several other contracts that have been completed within the last few years (for record purposes). We would also request that on all future contracts, that you could modify the request from the contractors to include this abbreviated format in addition to their regular minority participation reports. If you have any questions regarding this request, please call me at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm
encl.

cc: Imad Samara, COE
    Blair Smolar, COE
    Bob Huffman, LCRBDC
**LITTLE CALUMET RIVER PROJECT**  
**COMPLETED CONSTRUCTION SEGMENTS**  
**IN GARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage/Phase</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Contract Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II-1</td>
<td>North levee Broadway to Harrison</td>
<td>$357,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-2</td>
<td>North levee Harrison to Grant</td>
<td>$1,194,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3A</td>
<td>South levee Georgia to MLK Drive</td>
<td>$2,209,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>North &amp; South levee Grant to Chase</td>
<td>$6,762,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4</td>
<td>Black Oak Demolition</td>
<td>$385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3B</td>
<td>South levee Harrison to Georgia</td>
<td>$3,477,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-3C-2</td>
<td>South levee Grant to Harrison</td>
<td>$3,804,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-4</td>
<td>North levee Broadway to MLK Drive</td>
<td>$4,186,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1N</td>
<td>Cline to Burr (N. of Railroad)</td>
<td>$2,956,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1S</td>
<td>South of N.S. RR</td>
<td>$4,266,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-2A</td>
<td>North levee Burr to Clark</td>
<td>$3,329,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-2B</td>
<td>North levee Clark to Chase</td>
<td>$1,948,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 1</td>
<td>EJ&amp;E RR to Colfax</td>
<td>$2,228,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Reach</td>
<td>Remediation North of I-80/94, MLK to I-65</td>
<td>$1,873,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Completed levee segments</td>
<td>$1,335,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation 1</td>
<td>Gleason Park, Lake Etta, Stage III Trails</td>
<td>$634,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
$40,950,227

July 19, 2002
# Utility Relocation Costs (1986-1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hobart Water Company</td>
<td>$26,358.47</td>
<td>$26,358.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 3A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wolverine Pipeline</td>
<td>$48,723.53</td>
<td>$48,723.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 3B</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Gary</td>
<td>$6,642.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest IN Water Co.</td>
<td>$20,440.42</td>
<td>$99,095.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$72,012.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 3C</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Construction</td>
<td>$1,477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>$15,276.18</td>
<td>$17,031.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 3C-2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burke Electrical Construction</td>
<td>$2,423.99</td>
<td>$2,423.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II Phase 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest IN Water Company</td>
<td>$95,177.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$17,253.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75,242.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,169.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Pipeline</td>
<td>$424.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Rail</td>
<td>$1,434.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,498.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,849.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,731.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dyer Construction Company| $12,675          |                  |
|                         | $25,350          |                  |
|                         | $215,475         | $465,282.45      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIPSCO</td>
<td>$3,190.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$55,070.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$48,818.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ellas Construction       | $38,800          | $145,878.74      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage IV Phase 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Southern Railway</td>
<td>$5,563.71</td>
<td>$5,563.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage IV Phase 2A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Kirk</td>
<td>$72,716.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Engineering</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$146,770</td>
<td>$630,784.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                  | **$1,441,141.77** |                  |
LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM SEQUENCE

1. Request Gary (Mayor King) to cost participate in Burr Street Phase 2. Two reasons: (1) complete Gary and therefore, get Gary out of the floodplain and (2) get permit to start west reach

2. Work with COE, Congressman Visclosky, other state (Governor’s Office) & Commission to develop State budget request.

3. Meet with key area State legislators
   • Earl Harris & Chet Dobis to discuss budget request/support

4. Seek to get in Governor’s budget

5. Meet with West reach communities to gain their support & begin lobbying

6. Go to local papers/editorial boards for support
WORK STUDY SESSION  
ENGINEERING COMMITTEE  
August 1, 2002  
Bob Huffman, Committee Chairman

1. INDOT – Tri-State drainage issue  
   - Received a letter on July 17 – They indicated it would cause a 3-4 month delay on their project.  
   - Refer to Attachments 5-6 (Engineering report)

2. Contracts currently out for bids - Stage III Remediation & “In-Project” Mitigation  
   - Both projects were advertised on July 29; open bids in mid-August; and award the contracts no later than September 30.  
   - Stage III Remediation contract will correct drainage problems west of Grant Street and install a lift station in the Marshalltown area for interior drainage.  
   - In-project mitigation contract will provide mitigation on lands owned by LCRBDC west of Chase Street, south of the river, and east of Clark Road, north of the river.

3. Business Process Tracking Plan  
   - LCRBDC/COE coordination for outstanding issues, V.E. cost savings items, and technical issues  
   - Had a meeting with the COE on July 25  
   - Will modify, clarify, assign actions by September 5th Commission meeting. This will replace the “gray” report.

4. Coordination meeting  
   - This is the Liable to Cline area south of the river.  
   - We anticipate final real estate by August 25 and will have one final opportunity for comments on engineering.
LAND ACQUISITION:

1. We need action on two condemnations: DC 1032 and DC 1041. Both parcels have a swimming pool two to three feet into the temporary work easement. The Corps has modified the drawings so the construction contractors will avoid the pools, but the owners have asked for a letter of indemnification by the Little Cal in case these structures are damaged as a result of construction. We are providing the letters, however, the owners still may not be satisfied.

2.) Update on Hobart Marsh Mitigation: Appraiser Janet O'Toole is currently appraising the Kim (73 acres) and Fadell (50 acres) properties. She will have the appraisals completed by 8/19. The Corps can begin its review by 8/26 with a two to three week turnaround. Offers could out by 9/16.

Denise Brinson (61 acres) is selling 9 acres to Save the Dunes. She has been approached by a developer for the remaining 54 acres. She will not make her decision about the developer's offer until we make an offer.

LAND MANAGEMENT:

1.) We need action to approve using C.H. Mowing to mow the levees from Burr Street to Martin Luther King Drive in the amount of $6,000 based on their submitting the lowest bid. (First attachment.)

REPORT ON THE LAND ACQUISITION / MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7/30/02.

Charles Agnew Park Phase II: We need action on the recommendation to complete the handicapped accessible park. Playworld Systems Rep. Judee Roper has submitted an approximate figure of $44,000 for Phase II construction. (Second attachment.) The money will be deducted from the LEL escrow account and will be re-imbursed when LEL sells its first 32 credits in the area east of Clay Street where the park was originally suggested. LEL is submitting a letter at tonight's meeting assuring LCRBDC of that commitment.
Leases:

Chase Street Farm Stand: Property is currently being appraised for its total and rental value by Professional Appraisal Services. Report will be finished by the September Commissioners' meeting.

Village Shopping Center: Title work has been ordered to show proof of ownership to the New England owners. We're also reviewing the deeds to determine the exact location of the easement.

Disposition of Property:

We need action to "declare this parcel a surplus property."

Berkheimer's trucking has expressed interest in purchasing 6.5 acres of land north of 35th and west of Grant Street. We will order an appraisal to determine its fair market value. (Third attachment.)

We need action to "declare this parcel a surplus property."

The tenants of our rental unit at 3120 Gerry Street are currently investigating financing for the purchase of our rental. They're looking at the "Cop on the Block" Program which will provide 50% toward the purchase price as a down payment.

Pump Station Turnover Agreement:

We need action to approve the LCRBDC signing of this agreement.

The Town of Highland has approved the agreement at their 24 July Board of Sanitation meeting. This assures compliance that Highland will maintain the 81st Street and North Fifth Avenue Pump Stations and complete the annual paper work for the Corps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>COMPLAINTS MOOKING</th>
<th>S. SHORE MARINA</th>
<th>FAILED TO SUBMIT A BID</th>
<th>PRECISION LAWN</th>
<th>FAILED TO SUBMIT A BID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE/PHASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-2A</td>
<td>$245.0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II-28</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$225.0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$720.0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress Notes:**

1. **We recommend using C&H Mowing, Inc.**
   - To do this work based upon their submitting the lowest bid and upon their record of mowing this highway corridor for the past several years, and work done for the LCBRC in the past.
   - Bid includes mowing, levee crest, one pass each side of downstream, all areas, and conditions.
   - Work with trimming around planting areas.
   - This work should be completed no later than August 25, 2002.

**Levee Mowing Services - East Reach**

**Completed Segments - Burr St. to Milk**

**August 2002**

*We recommend using C&H Mowing, Inc. To do this work based upon their submitting the lowest bid and upon their record of mowing this highway corridor for the past several years, and work done for the LCBRC in the past.*

**General Notes:**

1. Bid includes mowing, levee crest, one pass each side of downstream, all areas, and conditions.
2. Work with trimming around planting areas.
3. This work should be completed no later than August 25, 2002.
Charles Agnew Handicapped Accessible Park
Final Phase
August 1, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment cost</th>
<th>$32006.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Installation</td>
<td>11680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$43686.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prices in effect for 2002.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (PLEASE PRINT)</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION, ADDRESS, PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Ewoldt</td>
<td>LEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra O'Brien</td>
<td>Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C M Bartholomew</td>
<td>P-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Flora</td>
<td>R W Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fakery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Bartholomew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, August 1, 2002
(Information in this report is from June 27, 2002 – July 25, 2002)

NON-PROJECT LAND MANAGEMENT
A. Handicapped-Accessible Park
   1. A Land Acquisition/Management committee meeting was held on 7/30/02. Park
decisions will be reported at the 8/1/02 Commission meeting.
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.
   2. We have started to receive invoices from the Gary Parks & Recreation Dept.
      They have requested a total of $97,388 from the total monies due them of $394,540
      (leaving a balance of $297,152 to draw upon)
C. Lease Agreements
   1. At the Land Acquisition/Management committee meeting held on 7/30, we
      reviewed the agreement with LEL and discussed status of Village Shopping Center
      and (2) other leases with the Chase Street Farm Stand and Berkheimers.
      • A memo was sent on 7/10/02 to the Committee members enclosing copies of
        the leases.
D. Disposition of property
   1. Commission members voted at the 7/9/02 meeting to sell the 3120 Gerry Street
      property for its appraised value of $36,000. First offer was agreed to go to current
      tenants, Mike and Melinda Adams. A letter was sent on 7/22/02. We are waiting for
      their response.
   2. A letter was sent to Berkheimer’s (Dale Cobble) on 7/24/02 informing him that
      we are now able to sell surplus property and asking him if he is still interested in
      purchasing additional property adjacent to their existing facilities so that they
      would be able to expand their business.

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.)
   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. 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.

2. A meeting was held on July 10 at the Lake County Emergency Management Hdgtrrs. and a video introduction was taped for the Gary closure structure instructional.

C. Portions of west reach pump stations in Hammond and Highland have been turned over to their respective communities. Representatives of the Hammond and Highland Sanitary Districts have inspected these facilities with the COE and Contractor and signed off as owner.

1. A letter was sent to Highland along with our proposed Inter-local Agreement on 6/28/02.
   - The town of Highland approved our agreement and signed it at their July 24th Board of Sanitary Commission meeting.
   - Now that the Agreement is signed, we will begin the turnover process to Highland.

D. Solicitation for bids to mow the levees was sent out on 7/18/02 with a due date of 7/26/02.
   - Four (4) contractors were sent the package and the cities of Hammond and Gary were contacted to see who they used. Specialized equipment is necessary and no one could qualify.
   - We coordinated with Indiana University (Spencer Cortwright) on 7/19/02 to assure we would not mow his plantings on the levee.

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 July 26, 2002.)
   - A follow-up letter was sent to the COE (Greg Moore) on 7/3/02 enclosing some general information on controlled burns. We want to assure that when we receive the final O&M submittal from the COE that they are satisfied with their specification.

2. We have received a petition from 10 landowners between Colfax and Calhoun citing problems and requesting action on the ditch easement on their property.
   - The COE is including the cleaning of the ditch in their upcoming contract. This should be done no later than August 9, 2002.

3. Work has been completed by AREA PLUMBING on the Taborski property west of Calhoun and north of the NSRR (DC448) that includes driveway/culvert removal and stone from the vacated garage area in the amount of $3,742.
   - The COE submitted an e-mail on 7/18/02 indicating this cost will be creditable.

4. LCRBDC (Jim Pokrajac) made a field inspection on 7/11/02 for all completed levee segments. Photos are available showing the overgrowth on the levees as well as vandalism.
   - Trails will need maintenance – stoning and re-grading. (We met with Michael Thomas from the IN Dunes National Lakeshore on 7/9/02). We received a trail maintenance sheet.
TO: Land Acquisition/Management Committee members – Committee Chairperson Arlene Colvin, Bob Marszalek, Curt Vosti, Attorney Lou Casale

FROM: Jim Pokrajac, Agent, Land Management/Engineering

SUBJECT: Current Leases

DATE: July 10, 2002

Enclosed are copies of the leases with the Village Farm Stand of South Holland (dba Chase Street Farm Stand), and G. W. Berkheimer Inc., along with a memorandum addressed to Lou Casale dated May 28, 2002 that transmits the current lease summary sheet that may be used for our upcoming Land Acquisition/Management committee meeting. At this meeting, we will discuss the modifying and increase of monies of these leases. Please review the leases and we will be calling you shortly to set up a meeting date and time satisfactory to all members. If you have any questions regarding these leases, please call me.

/sjm
encl.
cc: Judy Vamos
22 July 2002

Mr. and Mrs. Mike Adams
3120 Gerry Street
Gary, IN 46406

Dear Mike and Melinda,

RE: Disposition of the 3120 Gerry Street Property.

Thank you for speaking with me today about purchasing the 3120 Gerry Street property that you are currently renting. As we have previously discussed the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission was interested in selling the property but had to go through the state disposition of property procedure to be in compliance with regulations.

The procedure is now complete and the Commission at its public meeting on 9 July 2002 voted to put the property on the open market for the appraised price of $36,000 and offer you the first chance to purchase the property. It was also agreed that no time limit is or will be imposed on you as you make your decision and investigate purchasing or financing possibilities. As I stated in our conversation I will contact the Calumet Township Assessor to determine the probable property taxes for 2002 and call you with the information.

You have been exceptionally good tenants and I personally appreciate your loyalty to the project and patience in waiting for this opportunity.

Please call me if you have questions about this letter, the property, or the sale. I send my thanks for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
Mr. Dale Cobble  
BERKHEIMER COMPANY, INC.  
2310 West 35th Street  
Gary, Indiana 46401

Dear Dale:

As per your telephone conversation with Jim Pokrajac on Tuesday, July 23rd, we would like to pursue with you the potential for selling some of our surplus land to Berkheimer. We have just completed the necessary steps with the State of Indiana that would allow us the option of selling surplus property and we have now received authorization to dispose of any surplus property we own.

We currently have an agreement with you for approximately 2 acres of land to the east of your building that you use for parking. In past conversations, we understand that you might also be interested in purchasing land west of your building to allow for expansion of your facilities. Could you please respond back to us to let us know how much acreage Berkheimer would be interested in purchasing from the Development Commission? For your convenience, I have enclosed a sketch showing the property we own in that area, also showing the location of our permanent levee easement to your north that we need to keep to operate and maintain our flood control project. If you are interested in extending your request to your north up to that permanent easement line, please let us know. You may use this sketch to mark up and dimension the lands you are interested in and return this to us.

Upon receipt of your response, we will review this with our Board of Commissioners and get back to you. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dan Gardner  
Executive Director

/sjm  
encl.  
cc:  
Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney  
Arlene Colvin, LCRBDC  
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
NOTE:

This sketch is for informational purposes and is not to scale. The intent is to show approx. relationship of adjacent properties.

Current lease agreement for Berkheimers (2.05 acres, more or less)

July 24, 2002
June 28, 2002

Michael Griffin
Clerk-Treasurer of Highland
3333 Ridge Road
Highland, IN 46322

RE: Interlocal Agreement with the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission

Dear Mark:

Enclosed please find a redraft of the proposed Interlocal Agreement pertaining to pump stations at 81st Street and 5th Street. Due to the fact that easements have already been granted, a substantial portion of the work has been completed, and the Town of Highland will continue to operate and maintain the pumping stations with only periodic inspections by the Corps and/or Commission, I have greatly simplified the agreement. In my opinion, a signature of the Attorney General is not necessary as this agreement is not one for a separate legal entity or joint board under IC 36-1-7-3. Please review and contact me so we can work to finalize this matter.

Sincerely,

CASALE, WOODWARD & BULS, LLP

LMC/amo

Enclosure

cc: Dan Gardner  
    Jim Pokrajac
Tuesday, July 23, 2002

Louis M. Casale, Esq.
Casale, Woodward & Buls, LLP
Attorneys at Law
9223 Broadway, Suite A
Merrillville, Indiana 46410

Dear Lou:

I am writing in order to communicate to you that at its meeting of July 24, 2002, the Board of Sanitary Commissioners passed and adopted Resolution No. 2002-21: A Resolution Authorizing the Entry into An Agreement for Continuing Maintenance Services for Pump Stations Connected with a Federal Aid Flood Control and Recreation Project.

By its adoption, the Board approved and adopted the Agreement for the Construction, Operation, and Maintenance for Pumping Station Improvements in Highland, Indiana.

Enclosed, please find eight (8) originally executed copies of Resolution No. 2002-22 along with eight (8) executed counterparts for the agreement, signed by the proper officers of the Board of Sanitary Commissioners.

As we previously discussed, I hope that you will present this agreement to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for its consideration and favor. If adopted, please have its proper officers execute in the proper counterpart and return to me three (3) executed originals for our files.

Thank you, Lou, for patience and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Griffin, IAMC/CMC/CMFA
Clerk-Treasurer

Enclosures: (8)

C: Dan Gardner
John Bach
Dear John:

Enclosed is a location map showing the areas we propose to have mowed as part of our flood control project for the Little Calumet River. We estimate that approximately 32,599 linear feet will need to be mowed along the levee crest including one (1) pass on each side of the levee top (Type 1) mowing. In addition, we anticipate approximately 19,328 linear feet of mowing along I-80/94 that will include the levee crest and the entire side slope to the I-80/94 right-of-way. As part of this mowing, it will also be required to mow one (1) pass on the river side. Also enclosed is a general information and specification sheet as well as a bid form. Please fill out the bid form indicating the cost per section as noted along with total base bid that will be used to evaluate this proposal. This request is part of our solicitation for bids as required by the Board members and will be evaluated based upon the lowest total base bid and job experience.

Please submit this bid back to me no later than July 26th, and submit it to:

Jim Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering
Little Calumet River Basin
Development Commission
6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

If you have any questions regarding this proposal, please call me at the above number.

Sincerely,

[Handwritten Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent
Land Management/Engineering

/encl.
Sandy Mordus

From: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
To: <scortwr@iunhaw1.iun.indiana.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2002 10:40 AM
Subject: Mowing of levees at I.U.

Spencer:

It is that time of the year again for us to mow our levees. This will include the area directly north of Indiana University, that for the past couple of years, I have coordinated with you. We intend on doing the mowing early in August and need to have your input as to what to cut and what not to cut in that area. On July 11, I drove all of the levees in our flood control project area and found that the stoned recreational trail on top of the levee adjacent to I.U. has a tremendous amount of encroachment by the plants and grasses in that area. I would like to recommend cutting back these growths by at least 5 - 10' adjacent to the trail in order to prevent further encroachment and allow us access to maintain the trail with its intended design. Please contact me at your earliest convenience in order that I may facilitate this with our mowing contractor. Please respond back either via e-mail or you can call me at 219/763-0696.

Jim Pokrajac
Mr. Greg Moore  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
111 N. Canal Street  
Chicago, Illinois  60606-7206

Dear Greg:

Enclosed is some information regarding controlled burns. Also enclosed are pertinent regulations for the State of Indiana regarding open burning and/or controlled burns. I had a conversation with the Heartland Restoration Services Inc. who act as consultants for this type of work for various clients in northwest Indiana. I talked with Mr. Eric Ummel who has offered me general information and provided me with IDEM paperwork required to have a controlled burn as well as all the other necessary paperwork that would be needed to complete the prescribed burn.

As we have discussed a number of times in the past, we would like to pursue doing controlled burns for completed levee segments. You had told us in the past that controlled burns would be the most effective way to promote proper growth on the levees. During the past several years, the Development Commission has mowed the levees at least once or twice every year. We would hope that in the future, we would be able to facilitate controlled burns as per your recommendation. We would like to have, as part of the final O&M submittals for east reach maintenance, a finalized procedure that we may use as a guideline once the Development Commission starts accepting levee segments.

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

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James E. Pokrajac, Agent  
Land Management/Engineering

/sjm  
encl.  
cc:  Imad Samara  
      Tom Deja  
      Mark Reshkin, LCRBDC (w/copy)
Sandy Mordus

From: "Spokane, Chrystal L LRC" <Chrystal.L.Spokane@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
To: "Semara, Imad LRC" <Imad.Semara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>; "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2002 2:43 PM
Subject: RE: David Taborski (DC448) site work

Jim & Sandy -

I don't see a problem with a LERRD credit for the driveway/stone work for Tract DC448.

Chrystal Spokane
Realty Specialist

-----Original Message-----
From: Samara, Imad LRC
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 7:54 PM
To: 'Sandy Mordus'
Cc: Spokane, Chrystal L LRC
Subject: RE: David Taborski (DC448) site work

Jim I don't believe this is a relocation credit this is a damage credit which is real-estate credit. I would like to get Chrystal opinion on this. Chrystal please advise.

-----Original Message-----
From: Sandy Mordus [mailto:smordus@nirpc.org]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 4:13 PM
To: Samara, Imad LRC
Subject: David Taborski (DC448) site work

Imad:

Recently we obtained competitive bids for removing the old driveway and stone from the area that served David Taborski's old garage, which was removed due to our construction. The driveway and stoned area no longer served a purpose and the Development Commission had agreed at the time of purchasing the necessary easement from him that we would not only move the garage because of construction but would remove his driveway and stoned area. The low bid came in from Area Plumbing & Sewer Company in the amount of $3,742. This has recently been completed and inspected by the Development Commission and found to be satisfactory as per our scope of work. Accordingly, we are making arrangements to pay this amount to Area Plumbing and would like to have written acknowledgement from the COE that this cost will be creditable. Will you please respond to this request.

Thanks,
Jim Pokrajac

7/18/2002
Jim,

I am so sorry about the delay. I hope the information helps you out and is advantageous. The video shows the blade we use for grading our gravel trails and lots. It is a very handy piece of equipment and does a fine job. The only drawback is that it brings the larger size aggregate to the top, good for lots, but a little tougher for bicycles. This particular trail has a 3-4 inch top of Ag Lime, so a gentle touch is required when we grade this trail.

Attached is a copy of the trail maintenance guidelines that we use for this trail, the longest gravel trail in our inventory. Litter is picked up weekly during the summer so that helps with the inspection process. Many times visitor suggestions increase our trail inspections/maintenance. Foot, ATV, or vehicles are used for the inspections. Weed control is accomplished by grading, applications of herbicides (minimum strength Roundup), burning with propane torches or just plain old mowing and that depends on the condition and area.

If you have any further questions please feel free to call me.

Michael Thomas
Roads and Trails Supervisor
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
219-926-7561 Extension 515
# Trail Maintenance Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail:</th>
<th>Marquette</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Trail:</td>
<td>Level: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td>Educational, public, general hiking/recreational use, biking and accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Composition:</td>
<td>Ag Lime surface with 8 foot accessible wooden ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width and Tread Standards:</td>
<td>Maintain a tread width of 8 feet with 2 foot stabilized shoulders. Overhanging limbs and brush trimmed back 1 foot on each side as required to prevent encroachment and vision hindrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections:</td>
<td>Inspections will be conducted every other month throughout the year. Trail tread, hazard trees, bridge, boardwalk structures, benches, bike racks, bollards and signs will be inspected and deficiencies documented. Deficiencies will be corrected on the spot or scheduled for repairs in accordance with park standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Cycle:</td>
<td>Summer Season: Litter will be removed weekly; Trail maintenance will be every other month throughout the year. The maintenance performed at this time will not only address the immediate maintenance needs, but serves to prevent the need for future major trail rehab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend Trail Maintenance Crew:</td>
<td>One WG-6 Tractor Operator One WG-5 Maintenance Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Performed:</td>
<td>Tread surface repair; vegetation pruning, ground structure repair, hazard tree removal, and wood structure repair. Equipment will be used only on the main portion of the trail. Note: The surface maintained is restricted to 12 foot width total.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special conditions:</td>
<td>Due to threatened and endangered Flora and Fauna species in this area, caution is to be used during any and all maintenance. Rare species known to be associated with this trail include: Karner Blue Butterfly, Lupine, Northern Bush Honeysuckle, Red Honeysuckle, and Eastern Joint Weed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Submitted:**

Engineering Equipment Operator Supervisor

**Date:**

**CWRD:**

Chief of Resource Management

**Date:**

**Concurred:**

**Date:** 6/14/99
LAND ACQUISITION REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, August 1, 2002
(Information in this report is from June 27, 2002 – July 25, 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.
   - New COE reviewer has asked appraiser to make changes to the appraisal.

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 is currently under COE review. COE reviewer Greg Dorword and HQ reviewer Paul Klote made a site visit to Wicker Park on 7/24/02.

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

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 1) – Cline to Kennedy – North of the river, and Kennedy to Liable – South of the River:
1. Appraisals for Highland town, park, and Public Works parcels are complete and currently under review by the COE.
2. We received an appraisal for the Burger King property west of Cline Avenue in the amount of $90,000
   - We will present this to the COE for design re-considerations that could save considerable money on project costs.

STATUS (Stage VI-Phase 2) – Liable to Cline – South of the river:
1. We had a meeting with the COE on July 17 to review coordination, design, and real estate for Stage VI-2. RANI ENGINEERING was on a conference call.
   - We anticipate real estate drawings from RANI (2) weeks after they receive final information from the COE regarding engineering issues.
   - Imad anticipated the COE will have this to RANI by mid-August.

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. Mr. and Mrs. Gleason, landowners west of Hohman, are waiting for our response to a meeting with Jim Mandon in Munster about their street flooding in heavy rains.
Staff will set up a meeting with Mr. Mandon to discuss the COE’s letter regarding the 4 homes and the street flooding. Meeting has yet to be scheduled.

STATUS (Betterment Levee – Phase 2) Colfax to Burr Street, then North N.S. RR, then East (North of RR R/2) ½ between Burr and Clark, back over the RR, then South approx. 1,400 feet:
1. Acquisition deadline is currently on hold.
2. Existing offers will be paid, however, no new offers will be sent. Burr Betterment levee is not creditable.

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

IN-PROJECT MITIGATION:
1. A conference call was held with the COE, LEL, and the LCRBDC on July 18, 2002 to address some concerns from LEL regarding the bid release for this project.
   - The COE sent an e-mail to LCRBDC on July 18, 2002 stating that the real estate impacts have not changed from the first solicitation, nor was the COE seeking future credit for acreages in the temporary work area easements.

HOBART MARSH MITIGATION:
1. Surveys for the first three mitigation parcels would be approximately $24,000. However, in-house “preliminary property identifications” are sufficient for appraisal purposes. We are beginning those I.D’s. Appraiser Janet O’Toole will start appraisals on 7/29/02; completion date by 8/19/02. COE will review the appraisals starting about 8/26/02. Offers could be in mail by 9/16/02.
18 July 2002

Mr. G. Gregory Cvitkovich, North Township Trustee
5947 Hohman Avenue
Hammond, IN 46320

Dear Mr. Cvitkovich,

RE: A visit to the Wicker Park Golf Course by the Army Corps of Engineers Appraisal Reviewers

My letter today will inform you that the appraisal for the Wicker Memorial Park Golf Course by the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project is complete and has been submitted to the Army Corps of Engineers to review for compliance with federal appraisal regulations.

Additionally, I received a call today from the Army Corps Chicago District that two Appraiser Reviewers, Gregory Dorward of the Pittsburgh District and Paul Kline of the Cincinnati District, will be visiting Wicker Park on Wednesday 24 July 2002 at 10 am. They want to view the park to secure a better understanding of the appraisal.

They do not need a tour. They would like to walk the park independently and not interfere with play. I have asked them to register with your park personnel beforehand for everyone’s safety.

I send my thanks for your cooperation and ask that you call me at 219-763-0696 if you have questions about my letter or the project. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
MEMO

TO: Jim Pokrajac, Engineering

FROM: Judy Vamos, Land Acquisition

DATE: Monday, 22 July 2002

SUBJ: The appraisal on DC 1010-D - the old Burger King site

Attached to this MEMO is the appraisal for DC 1010-D, the old Burger King site in the Kennedy Industrial Park area. Appraiser Dale Kleszynski delivered it on Friday, 19 July 2002.

Please use this appraisal for the Army Corps feasibility study on whether to substitute an earthen levee in place of the proposed I-wall on the site for flood protection. When the Corps reaches a decision I will contact Dale to update the appraisal if changes are necessary.

Please contact me if you have questions. Thanks.
Dan as discussed today in the conference call I would reiterate these 2 points:

1) The Re-Solicitation of the In-Project Lands did not impact the real estate ROE your office provided for the original solicitation. We have not changed the permanent easements limits nor that we have changed the temporary easements limits.

2) We are not and we will not in the future seek credits for the acreages identified as temporary easement limits in the ROE Plans.

I hope this will clarify any concerns that others may had regarding this Re-Solicitation.

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

7/18/2002
MEMO

TO: Jim Pokrajac, Engineering  

FROM: Judy Vamos, Land Acquisition  

DATE: 17 July 2002  

SUBJ: Preliminary Property Identification on Hobart Marsh Properties

Attached are a Sidwell, drawing, and two title searches to DC# M-3, a Hobart Marsh Mitigation tract. Are these enough to complete or at least get a start on a preliminary property identification for an appraisal?

DC# M-3 consists of two parcels both owned by the same owner:

Owner: Barbara Fadell  
Parcel 1: 32.73 acres, title work #920022482  
Parcel 2: 7.212 acres. Title work #920022481  

Remember that the offer will come from the Indiana Department of Natural Resources so title the drawing in the name of the IN DNR.

I'm at Meridian Title in the morning and will return in the afternoon to help with more information. Thanks!
COE/LCRBDC ENGINEERING
COORDINATION REPORT
FOR MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2002
(Information in this Report is from June 27, 2002 – July 25, 2002)

-GENERAL STATEMENT:
A. The COE put together a tracking plan for outstanding project issues that they
gave to the LCRBDC for review and comment on June 6, 2002.
1. The LCRBDC added a number of items to this plan that will address, and
summarize, the status of this report.
2. LCRBDC sent an e-mail to the COE on July 8 indicating that it was
important to have ALL remaining items that are not resolved to be on this list to
indicate the status, whose responsibility it is for action, and suggested a meeting
to review this list.
   • This meeting was held on July 25 with the COE, and a final table will be
     completed that will be available to the Commissioners at our next
     scheduled meeting.

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.
Sandy Mordus

From: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
To: "Samara, Imad LRC" <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
Cc: <jflora@rwa.com>
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2002 2:11 PM
Subject: Re: Business Process Sheets

Imad:

I just received your email regarding the Business Process Tracking Plan referencing your letter dated June 6, 2002 that was presented to us on the day of our Commission meeting. Jim Flora and I had followed your instructions in that letter by adding to the items you presented. In your June 6th letter, you indicated that the intent of this plan was to address present issues or concerns that the COE and the Development Commission are working to resolve. Those issues we added, the Development Commission felt should be incorporated into the Business Process Tracking Plan because they have never been resolved or they need further discussion. You mentioned in your email that you felt we had changed the format. The only column that was added to your original sheets was a column regarding "Next Action By". We took the liberty to take the items and incorporate our additional items with them in order that these could ALL be on the same tracking plan for simplicity. In order that we get on the same page, I suggest a face-to-face meeting to get agreement on the categories, status and "next action by" statements in the chart. We should set a date when you are at the Commission meeting tomorrow.

Jim Pokrajac

----- Original Message -----
From: Samara, Imad LRC
To: 'Little Calumet River B.D.C.'
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2002 12:55 PM
Subject: Business Process Sheets

Jim I just received your fax regarding the BPS. I thought I requested comets and any issues that you feel needed to be added. I'm disappointed in the fact that you re-did the Sheets and changed the format. You did not just add issue you have repeated the issues that was on the original report. I would have liked you and me discussing these changes before you put the effort on redoing the sheets. I still like the format that I had and I will evaluate your request of adding issues. You do have your owned reports that you submit to the commissioners, this one is the COE report. The only things that need to be consistent with our reports are the facts and the actions. I will be happy to discuss the format with you. I wanted the format to be simple and easy. And I will keep it that way. I will work on getting the updated sheets to Sandy by Monday.

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

7/8/2002
RECREATION REPORT
For meeting on Thursday, August 1, 2002

(Information in this report is from June 27, 2002 – July 25, 2002)

GENERAL STATEMENT:
A. At this point in time, the existing construction contracts in the East Reach are almost all completed. The only remaining area of construction is the Betterment Levee – Phase II.
B. Currently, the joint recreation venture with the Army Corps is completed; 90% of the completed east reach levees have stoned trails completed; the remainder of east reach trails is currently being coordinated and should be included in an upcoming recreation contract. It is anticipated that the next recreation contract may be in 2003-2004, and that the construction and real estate costs for this work would be delayed until that contract is ready to let.

- A supplemental contract will be included as part of the Stage III remediation project which will be released for bids in August of 2002. That will include the paving of all stoned ramps.
C. A field inspection of all completed recreation features was done by the LCRBDC on July 11, 2002. (Photos are available).

- Plants and weeds are encroaching on the stoned trails reducing their width. Some are actually growing out of the stone on the trails.
- Some vandalism was found – Signage pulled down, and a portion of an observation deck has burned out planking.
- The Gleason Park trail and the Chase Street trail that were part of the Recreation Phase 1 project will require some clean-up and tree trimming, as per our agreement with Gary. We will contact them to do this O&M.

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

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

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

C. LAKE ETTA (Lake County Parks)
   1. October 27th, 1998 was the date that this facility was turned over to the Lake County parks department.
D. CHASE STREET TRAIL (City of Gary)
   1. October 27th, 1998 was the date that this facility was turned over to the City of Gary.

EAST REACH RECREATION

A. Recreation trail re-alignments will be required in the east reach due to conflicting land use plans with City of Gary, I.U. Northwest, or other regulatory groups. (Refer to general statement.)
   1. Broadway to Harrison Crossing – Stage II-3B: (Currently on hold until the next recreation contract.)
      - Additional land will be required to temporarily extend a recreation trail along both the sidewalks east and west of Broadway to allow recreation trail continuation. (Refer to Recreation Report.)
      - Upon completion of I.U. Northwest modifications on, and adjacent to, Broadway, we will install a permanent trail crossing south of the river and along the line of flood protection, as originally proposed by the COE.

2. Harrison to Grant Street Crossing: (Currently on hold until the next recreation contract.)
   - We received a letter from the City of Gary on July 11th, 2001, indicating that our proposal East of Gilroy Stadium to 32nd Avenue is the best use location from Harrison to Grant.
   - The re-location of the recreation trail would require agreements with the City of Gary to be able to cross Grant St. at the light at 32nd Ave.
   - In the COE letter dated February 7th, 2002, they indicated, under the “remaining East Reach recreation features” response, that these remaining features will be incorporated into the next recreation contract.

3. We submitted a request to Attorney Casale on August 3rd, 2002, along with a letter from the EJ & E RR to proceed with an agreement to allow us to install an at-grade recreation trail crossing East of Cline Avenue.
   - We received a letter from the EJ & E on September 1st, 1999, allowing us to proceed along with their requirements. (To Lou at September 10th, 2001 utility coordination meeting.)
   - The scope of this work will be done as part of the Recreation Phase 2 project instead of Stage VI-2.

WEST REACH RECREATION

A. Cline Avenue Crossing:
   1. We had recreation coordination meetings with Highland and Griffith to determine trail relocations which allow us to cross at Cline Avenue at Highway Avenue
      - A field meeting was held with Griffith on June 27th, 2001 to walk and review potential recreational trail adjustments east of Cline.
      - A meeting was held with Highland on July 5th, 2001, to review the recreation trail location west of Cline Ave. A follow-up meeting was held with the Cline Avenue Baptist Church on July 16th, 2001, to review the possibility of getting an easement across their property adjacent to Cline Ave.
2. A letter was sent to the COE on July 23rd, 2001 along with sketches showing the proposals and suggesting a meeting to review and discuss these locations.
- To date, this was not included in the Stage VI-2 engineering drawings.
- The COE indicated to LCRBDC on July 17 (in a conference call with RANI ENGINEERING) that this will also be part of the Recreation Phase 2 project.

B. Tri-State recreational trail tie-in for the Highland/Wicker Park/Erie Lackawanna Trail Systems: (Part of Stage V – Phase 2 construction.)
1. The COE modified the engineering and real estate drawings and submitted them to us at the Real Estate meeting on July 19th, 2001. It is still the intent to have this recreation trail on the land side. (Refer to Land Acquisition & Engineering Reports).
2. North Township – Wicker Park recreational trail alignment is being evaluated.
   - It was mentioned to re-locate the trail from between the golf courses to the existing trail along the West and South boundaries.
   - North Township would not have a problem, but are awaiting information from INDOT for impacts to Indianapolis Blvd. R/W which would cause their existing trail to be re-located. (Ongoing)

C. A letter was sent to the Lake County Highway Dept. on December 28, 2000 requesting permission, and comments, to cantilever a walkway on the east side of the Kennedy Avenue bridge to allow our trail to be contiguous.
1. It was approved at our February 1st, 2001 Board meeting to contract with R.W. Armstrong to do a feasibility study for the pedestrian walkway and get an agreement at a cost not to exceed $7,000.
   - It is our intent to include this construction as part of the Stage VI – Phase 1 contract.
   - R.W. Armstrong submitted a cost to coordinate and design this walkway in the amount of $26,000. The board deferred doing this work until a later date due to financial constraints. (See Stage VI-I Engineering Report.)
2. We coordinated this with the COE through e-mails and on July 3, 2002 the COE agreed that this design will be addressed in their next fiscal year.

D. Stage VIII Trails:
1. We received a letter from NICTD on October 15th, 2001 (dated October 9th) indicating problems with the location of our trail on their R/W under I-80/94.
   - They feel it is a safety concern and suggested we reroute our trail along their R/W to 173rd Street.
   - LCRBDC is currently contacting NICTD to do a review with the Corps, and SEH (Corps engineer) to discuss their request.
2. A meeting was held with NICTD on March 11th, 2002, to review recreation trail re-alignment, review hydraulic information, and discuss other local and COE concerns.
   - It appears we may be doing our construction in this area before the railroad would be proceeding. It is our intent to use our current design and when they proceed, we can work together accordingly.
Sandy Mordus

From: "Samara, Imad LRC" <Imad.Samara@lrc02.usace.army.mil>
To: "Sandy Mordus" <smordus@nirpc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2002 10:45 AM
Subject: RE: Sandy here

The point I'm making is that this will be addressed when the design of Stage VI-1 and V-2 proceeds and that will take place next fiscal year FY 03. If you have brought this up in the past and it was not addressed, we will make sure it gets addressed this time.

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

-----Original Message-----
From: Sandy Mordus [mailto:smordus@nirpc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 03, 2002 10:26 AM
To: Samara, Imad LRC
Subject: Re: Sandy here

Imad:

During the review process, it was pointed out to both Stanley Associates (SV P2) and St. Paul COE (SVI P1) that there were no sidewalks on the Kennedy Avenue Bridge. There is barely an 18" "walkway" that does not accommodate even pedestrian traffic. We had talked with your engineering office in the past indicating that before the final engineering has been finalized, and the project goes out for bids, this cantilevered walkway should be included as part of the plans and specifications. You have indicated that you would be interested in the information we have from the feasibility study by R. W. Armstrong. We will forward this to you prior to your proceeding with the completion of the VI-1 plans.

Jim Pokrajac

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Samara, Imad LRC
To: 'Sandy Mordus'
Cc: iflora@rwa.com
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2002 2:31 PM
Subject: RE: Sandy here

Jim, from your email you are saying that it is not clear to you how the trail will proceed from north of the Little Calumet River to the South of the river at Kennedy Avenue. Your saying the existing bridge is not adequate to accommodate the trail. We will re-look at the plans for Stages VI-1 and V-2 since they both end and start at Kennedy Avenue. This task will not start until we proceed with the completion of Stage VI-1 plans. This will start in fiscal year 2003 which starts in Oct. 2002. if you feel there is information available that would help us in defining the trail at Kennedy please provided that information. When the work on Stage VI-1 start I will let you know so that we can work on this together.

Imad N Samara
Project Manager

7/3/2002
A few years back, we met with R. W. Armstrong Company and the Lake County Highway Dept. to review the possibility of installing a cantilevered walkway on the east side of the Kennedy Avenue bridge. This is necessary because we cannot make our recreational trail contiguous without being able to cross over the Little Calumet River at Kennedy Avenue. The current COE recreational trail layout indicates that on the east side of Kennedy Avenue, the trail is south of the river and on the west side of Kennedy Avenue, it is on the north side of the river. There are no existing walkways on the Kennedy Avenue bridge that will accommodate our needs; accordingly, this walkway will be necessary. We would propose that the COE provide a design for this walkway and incorporate it into the Stage VI Phase 1 plans and specifications as part of the contract. For your information, R. W. Armstrong completed a feasibility study dated April 5, 2001 for the completion of this task with several different options. This information is available to you upon request. Will you make arrangements to coordinate this request and let me know if I may be of any assistance.

Jim Pokrajac
**CALUMET AREA OFFICE**  
**CONTRACT STATUS REPORT**  
**09 JUN - 24 JUL 2002**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0071</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: RAUSCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE II - PHASE 3B</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No. 959776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: GARCES</th>
<th>ORIGINAL: $3,293,968.00</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWATKA</td>
<td>CURRENT: $2,477,249.66</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CURRENT: 05 DEC 98</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $3,477,249.66</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 05 DEC 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $3,280,112.42</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
Contractor has one (1) punchlist item remaining, and will complete soon. Will schedule final inspection with Local Sponsor soon.

Reviewing draft next to last payment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0073</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: DYER CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE IV - PHASE 2A</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No. 759328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: GARCES</th>
<th>ORIGINAL: $2,473,311.50</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: RUNDZAITIS</td>
<td>CURRENT: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CURRENT: 29 SEP 01</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 29 SEP 01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $3,329,463.66</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
Local Sponsor scheduling final inspection of generator plug-in modification.

Initiating Contract Closeout.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to following: ED-DT correction 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW23-95-C-0076</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: RAUSCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE II - PHASE 4</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No. 608714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: GARCES</th>
<th>ORIGINAL: $3,089,692.00</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWATKA</td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,186,070.75</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: -</td>
<td>CURRENT: 22 SEP 98</td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $4,182,688.98</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 22 SEP 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $4,175,000.00</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**  
Contractor will complete punchlist soon. Will schedule final inspection with Local Sponsor soon.

Finalizing quantities on all unit priced items. Contractor provided final supporting data. CO-S and Contractor to discuss next week.

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: CO-S forwarded As-Builts to CO-C for signature. Awaiting return of CO-S and Local Sponsor required signed copies.
### 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 ORIGINAL: $2,074,072.70</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION ORIGINAL: 24 JUN 01</th>
<th>% COMPLETE SCH ACT</th>
<th>100 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: WALDRUM</td>
<td>CURRENT: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td>CURRENT: 24 JUL 01</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 24 JUL 01</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $2,228,652.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Financial Closeout Completed. Preparing files for transfer to District.

### CONTRACT NO: DACW27-01-C-0001
**DESCRIPTION:** PUMP STA. 1A
**CONTRACTOR:** OVERSTREET ELEC. CO.
**PR & C NO.** 015179

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: SMOLAR</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT ORIGINAL: $4,638,400.00</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION ORIGINAL: 03 DEC 02</th>
<th>% COMPLETE SCH ACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: CRAIB</td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,743,171.99</td>
<td>CURRENT: 11 FEB 03</td>
<td>44 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,169,859.49</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: -</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $2,071,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**
Labor Union issues, have been resolved. Subcontractor back to work.

Contractor is continuing with submittals.

Contractor has placed SWP-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 Kennedy; FC-01.19 – Kennedy-Power Connection for Temp. Overload & Leak Indicator; FC-01.21 – Voltage Separation at All Four (4) Pump Stations –$67,652.80 and 30 calendar days. Preparing modification.

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

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

P0000 (FC-01.20) – Continuing Contract Funding, $600K. Preparing Modification.
CONTRACT NO: DACW27-01-C-0008
DESCRIPTION: PUMP NORTH 5TH AVE.
CONTRACTOR: OVERSTREET CONST. CO.
PR & C NO. 115055

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO-S MGR: SMOLAR</th>
<th>CONTRACT AMOUNT</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION</th>
<th>% COMPLETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,387,500.00</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 17 MAR 03</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT: $2,417,023.93</td>
<td>CURRENT: 17 MAR 03</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED: $1,629,523.93</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED: $1,323,000.00</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

Labor Union issues, have been resolved. Subcontractor back to work.

Contractor preparing and submitting submittals.

Removal of old and installation of new electrical equipment is ongoing.

New pumps have been delivered and are in storage.

DWP-1 and DWP-2 installation has begun.

Modifications to concrete discharge boxes and wet well are ongoing.

P00003 (FC-08.10) – $850,000.00 Funding; Executed and Distributed.

FC-08.04 – DELETE three (3) Ton Portable Gantry Crane. Negotiated and Preparing Mod.

FC-08.08 – Modify Existing Flap Valve Mounting Flange to Accommodate More Bolts. Negotiated and Preparing Mod.

FC-08.09 – Extend Access Ladder; Received Proposal. Negotiated and Preparing Mod.

FC-08.11 – Replacing corroded piping into wall on Pump Nos. 6 and 7. Issued RFP.

FC-08.12 – Revision from manholes & underground service to above ground. Negotiated and preparing Mod.

Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following items: None at this time.
## Contract No: DACWXX-XX-C-00XX
### Description: LITTLE CAL STG. VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Contract Completion</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED:</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED:</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Design Ongoing.

---

## Contract No: DACWXX-02-C-00XX
### Description: STAGE III REMEDIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Contract Completion</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED:</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED:</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Completed Backcheck review.

---

## Contract No: DACWXX-XX-C-00XX
### Description: LITTLE CAL STAGE IV-PHASE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
<th>Contract Completion</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>ORIGINAL:</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td>CURRENT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIGATED:</td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EARNED:</td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
Performed 100% BCOE. ED/PM/A/E responding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW23-97-C-0026</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: DYER CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE IV-2B</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No.: 769388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: GARCÉS</td>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWATKA</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $1,530,357.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>CURRENT: $1,948,053.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $1,948,053.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $1,948,053.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 16 NOV 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: 30 SEP 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 30 SEP 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.: 23 JUL 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 100</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW27-00-C-0003</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: DILLON CONTRACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE IV-PHASE 1 NORTH</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No.: 422358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: ANDERSON</td>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWATKA</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $2,708,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>CURRENT: $2,956,964.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $2,956,964.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $2,956,964.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 07 JAN 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: 01 MAY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 01 MAY 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.: 01 MAY 02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 100</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACT NO: DACW27-00-C-0015</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR: DYER CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: STAGE IV - PHASE 1 SOUTH</td>
<td>PR &amp; C No.: 476674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S MGR: ANDERSON</td>
<td>CONTRACT AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-S QA REP: KARWATKA</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: $3,862,736.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO-C MGR: TURNER</td>
<td>CURRENT: $4,266,494.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OBLIGATED: $4,266,494.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EARNED: $4,266,494.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACT COMPLETION</td>
<td>ORIGINAL: 09 AUG 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT: 16 NOV 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUBSTANTIAL: 16 NOV 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FINAL W/O D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% COMPLETE</td>
<td>SCH ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:
One (1) punchlist item remaining.

FC-15.21 – PM directed repair damage to IV-1 North Structure by automobile, additional rip-rap IV-1 North, Landscape repairs to IV-1 South levees damaged by WIND, and cleaning of IV-1 North concrete ditch. Awaiting complete proposal from Contractor.
Awaiting PM-M/ED-D responses to the following items: None at this time.
Tuesday, July 23, 2002

Louis M. Casale, Esq.
Casale, Woodward & Buels, LLP
Attorneys at Law
9223 Broadway, Suite A
Merrillville, Indiana 46410

Dear Lou:

I am writing in order to communicate to you that at its meeting of July 24, 2002, the Board of Sanitary Commissioners passed and adopted Resolution No. 2002-21: A Resolution Authorizing the Entry into An Agreement for Continuing Maintenance Services for Pump Stations Connected with a Federal Aid Flood Control and Recreation Project.

By its adoption, the Board approved and adopted the Agreement for the Construction, Operation, and Maintenance for Pumping Station Improvements in Highland, Indiana.

Enclosed, please find eight (8) originally executed copies of Resolution No. 2002-22 along with eight (8) executed counterparts for the agreement, signed by the proper officers of the Board of Sanitary Commissioners.

As we previously discussed, I hope that you will present this agreement to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for its consideration and favor. If adopted, please have its proper officers execute in the proper counterpart and return to me three (3) executed originals for our files.

Thank you, Lou, for patience and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Griffin, IAMC/CMC/CMFA
Clerk-Treasurer

Enclosures: (8)

C: Dan Gardner
   Jim Pokrajac
   John Bach
A Resolution Authorizing the Entry into an Agreement for Continuing Maintenance Services for Pump Stations Connected with a Federal Aid Flood Control and Recreation Project

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation organized pursuant to IC 36-9-25 et seq., and The State of Indiana, through its Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, organized pursuant to IC 14-13-2 et seq., are political subdivisions or State entities empowered by the aforesaid Interlocal Cooperation act, as amended to contract on behalf of each other on a basis of mutual advantage so as to better provide public services and facilities all under the authority of IC 14-13-2-18(9) and IC 36-9-25-10(14); and

Whereas, The Little Calumet River Basin Commission is a public body corporate and politic of the State of Indiana capable of entering into and fulfilling the requirements of a nonfederal interest (as defined by 42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b); and

Whereas, The State of Indiana, through the Little Calumet River Basin Commission, has presented an agreement which provides for a perpetual easement to be granted by the Town of Highland as Grantor, to the State of Indiana, Little Calumet River Basin Commission as Grantee, in support of the rehabilitation of the 81st Street Pump Station and Fifth Street Pump Station, all to be completed in association with the US Army Corps Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project; and

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation organized pursuant to IC 36-9-25 et seq., as a political subdivision of the State, may, upon the terms and conditions that the proper authorities of the Town and the State of Indiana through the Little Calumet River Basin Commission consider reasonable and appropriate, lease, lend, grant, or convey to the commission, at the commission's request, real or personal property, including an interest in the property, owned by the entity that is necessary or convenient to achieving the purposes of IC 14-13-2, all pursuant to IC 14-13-2-14; and

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation, now wishes to authorize, approve and grant and ratify such a perpetual easement on the property herein described, related to the rehabilitation of several Pump Stations;

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation and by its Board of Sanitary Commissioners, now desires to enter into an
agreement constructed pursuant to IC. 14-13-2-18(9) and IC 36-9-25-10(4), with the State of Indiana, through and by its Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, to provide for the design, construction and the continuing maintenance of certain improvements made in consequence of the construction to the 81st and Fifth Street storm water and waste water pumping stations;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation and by its Board of Sanitary Commissioners as follows:

Section 1. That the Agreement for the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Pumping Station Improvements in the Town of Highland, Indiana between the State of Indiana, through and by its Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation and by its Board of Sanitary Commissioners is hereby authorized, approved and adopted in all respects.

Section 2. That the President of the Board of Sanitary Commissioners is hereby authorized and permitted to evidence this adoption and execution of the agreement by affixing his signature to the agreement and any related documents in support of its carrying out its purposes; further, the Secretary is hereby authorized to attest the execution of said agreement by the President of the Board;

Section 3. That a copy of the Agreement for the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Pumping Station Improvements in the Town of Highland, Indiana shall be attached to this Resolution and incorporated herein by reference;

Section 4. That this Resolution shall take effect and be in full force and effect from and after its passage by the Board of Sanitary Commissioners of the Town of Highland, Lake County, Indiana.

Duly passed, resolved and adopted by the Board of Sanitary Commissioners of the Department of Public Sanitation of Highland, Lake County, Indiana, this 24th Day of July 2002, by a vote of 3 in favor and 0 opposed.

TOWN of HIGHLAND DEPARTMENT of PUBLIC SANITATION
By its Board of Sanitary Commissioners:

David Jones, President

Attest:

Joseph Fralick, Secretary

Resolution for Adoption of Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission Agreement
AGREEMENT FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION
AND MAINTENANCE OF PUMPING STATION
IMPROVEMENTS IN
THE TOWN OF HIGHLAND, INDIANA

WHEREAS, The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission (hereinafter the “COMMISSION”) is a public body corporate and politic of the state of Indiana, authorized, empowered and acting as a nonfederal interest (as defined by 42 USC 196 2d-5b) for the United States Army Corps of Engineer’s (hereinafter the “CORPS”) Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project (hereinafter the “PROJECT”) in Lake County, Indiana; and,

WHEREAS, a portion of the PROJECT consists of the construction of improvements to the 81st Street and 5th Street storm water and wastewater pumping stations, (hereinafter the IMPROVEMENTS) owned and operated by the Town of Highland, through its department of sanitation (hereinafter the “TOWN”); and,

WHEREAS, it has been determined by the COMMISSION and the TOWN to be mutually advantageous and in the best interests of both parties hereto and the citizens of the TOWN and the State of Indiana that they enter into this Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, the TOWN and COMMISSION, in furtherance of the PROJECT, have executed the easements and adopted the resolutions which are attached hereto and marked Exhibit “A”, and,

WHEREAS, the CORPS either has completed or has substantially completed the IMPROVEMENTS on behalf of the COMMISSION and the TOWN and desires to turn the IMPROVEMENTS over to the COMMISSION and the TOWN for operation and maintenance.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual terms, covenants and conditions set forth herein, the COMMISSION and the TOWN agree as follows:
ARTICLE I
DURATION

The duration of this Agreement shall be from the date of signing by duly authorized representatives of both parties hereto until such time as both parties hereto agree, in writing, to revoke or modify this Agreement.

ARTICLE II
PURPOSE

The purpose of this Agreement is to provide a mechanism for both Parties hereto to allow for the design and construction of improvements to several storm water and wastewater pumping stations, more particularly described as the 81st Street and the 5th Street storm water and wastewater pumping stations, owned and operated by the TOWN (hereinafter the "PUMPING STATIONS"), said design and construction to be done by the CORPS as part of the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project and to further provide for the ongoing operation and maintenance of the PUMPING STATIONS.

ARTICLE III
MANNER OF FINANCING AND CONSTRUCTING

1. The design and construction of the PUMPING STATIONS shall be financed by the CORPS and the COMMISSION pursuant to the Local Cooperation Agreement between the COMMISSION and the CORPS, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked Exhibit "B", (hereinafter the "LCA").

2. The construction shall occur at the PUMPING STATIONS owned and operated by the TOWN and pursuant to plans and specifications provided by the CORPS. The TOWN has provided assignable real estate interest, rights of entry, Easements or Easement to the COMMISSION for the CORPS to construct and inspect the PUMPING STATIONS and IMPROVEMENTS.
ARTICLE IV
OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, ADMINISTRATION AND STAFFING

1. After the COMMISSION and CORPS complete the construction of the PROJECT and turn the completed PROJECT over to the TOWN, the TOWN shall, at its sole cost, operate and maintain the completed PUMPING STATIONS and IMPROVEMENTS.

2. The TOWN will provide, at its sole cost, the necessary administration and staffing to operate, maintain and inspect the PUMPING STATIONS and IMPROVEMENTS in compliance with the LCA and the Federal Rules and Regulations pertaining thereto including, but not limited to, CORPS' guidelines for operation, maintenance and inspection which will be provided to the TOWN upon execution of this Agreement.

3. The TOWN hereby gives the COMMISSION and the CORPS the right to enter, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner, the PUMPING STATIONS for the purpose of inspection.

ARTICLE V
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

1. It is understood and agreed by the parties hereto that this agreement is made subject to the provisions and conditions that apply to expenditure of funds and project design, development and operation as provided in the LCA and the parties agree to comply fully with all of the provisions and restrictions applicable thereto.

2. The COMMISSION and TOWN shall periodically, but in no event less than annually, review the operation and management of the PUMPING STATIONS
and IMPROVEMENTS regarding compliance with the terms and conditions of the LCA.

3. The TOWN is aware of its rights to just compensation for real property as provided by Federal and State statute and hereby waives its rights thereunder.

4. In the event that either party fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions of this agreement, the other party may terminate same and take such legal and/or equitable action as it deems necessary to enforce this agreement and for costs of such action including attorneys fees to the prevailing party.

5. This agreement shall bind the successors and assigns of the parties hereto.

6. The TOWN shall grant such additional easements and/or rights of entry as may be deemed necessary to carry out the intent of this Agreement.

7. In the event the TOWN deems it advisable, and/or expedient or in its best interest to add to the modifications to be designed and constructed by the CORPS, it shall do so only after approval of the plans and specifications by the CORPS and at its, the TOWN’S, sole expense.

8. This Agreement may be executed in several counterparts, each of which when so executed shall be deemed to be an original, and such counterparts, together, shall constitute but one and the same instrument, which shall be sufficiently evidenced by any such original counterpart.
Participant Counterpart

EFFECTIVE DATE. This Agreement shall be effective under Paragraph 1 of this Agreement after the same has been ratified by each of the participating entities by Resolution.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Agreement to be executed in their names and on their behalf as of the date first written above.

TOWN OF HIGHLAND, INDIANA
Department of Public Sanitation and Sanitary District
3333 Ridge Road, Highland, IN 46322

Its Board of Sanitary Commissioners

By: __________________________

David Jones, President

Attest:

_____________________________________

Joseph Haney, Secretary

Participant Execution Date: __________________________

Approved: __________________________

By: __________________________

Mark A. Herak, Town Council President
Municipal Executive, Town of Highland

Participant Execution Date: __________________________
Participant Counterpart

EFFECTIVE DATE. This Agreement shall be effective under Paragraph 1 of this Agreement after the same has been ratified by each of the participating entities by Resolution.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have cause this Agreement to be executed in their names and on their behalf as of the date first written above.

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

By: ____________________________________________

William Tanke, Chairman

Attest:

____________________________________________

Secretary of the Commission

____________________________________________

Executive Director of the Commission

Participant Execution Date: ______________________
Gary asked to fund flood-control project

Little Cal board seeks $2.5 million to replace amount pulled by state.

BY CAROLE CARLSON
Post-Tribune staff writer

With state money washed up for a flood-control project, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission hopes the city of Gary will bail out the state's expected $2.5 million share.

That option will be discussed at 6 tonight as the commission meets at its headquarters at 6100 Southport Road in Portage. The meeting site is west of Indiana 249 and north of Interstate 94.

In March, the commission lost $2.5 million in state funding when Gov. Frank O'Bannon cut $248 million from the Build Indiana Fund because of the state's own budget crisis.

The commission needs state or local money to meet its matching commitment for federal funding, said Dan Gardner, executive director of the commission.

Begun in 1990 near Interstate 65 in Gary, the $181 million half-completed project involves a system of earthen levees along a 9-mile stretch of the river through Gary, Highland, Munster and Hammond. The project stalled at Burr Street when O'Bannon cut the state money.

Overall, the commission received $5.5 million for the project over the two-year biennium budget cycle.

It's the money in the second year of the budget that's been lost, said Gardner.

Gardner met last month with Gary Mayor Scott King, and he said the mayor was receptive to the request for assistance.

“He said he'll try to make the effort. He understands the dilemma,” Gardner said.

King could not be reached for comment Wednesday.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency won't release Gary from its floodplain designation until the project is completed, according to Gardner.

The Burr Street levee and drainage ditch would run from Colfax Avenue to the Burr Street pump station along the Little Calumet River.

The levee would protect the Black Oak area.

Reporter Carole Carlson can be reached at 648-3085 or by e-mail at ccarlson@post-trib.com.
## Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract</th>
<th>Total Contract Cost</th>
<th>FY 00 Fed</th>
<th>FY 00 Non-Fed</th>
<th>Total Per FY</th>
<th>FY 01 Fed</th>
<th>FY 01 Non-Fed</th>
<th>Total Per FY</th>
<th>FY 02 Fed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Reach Rem.</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$1,302,000</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 North</td>
<td>$3,013,911</td>
<td>$2,809,000</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>$2,770,000</td>
<td>$226,837</td>
<td>$17,074</td>
<td>$243,911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV-1 South</td>
<td>$4,286,494</td>
<td>$2,095,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$1,546,344</td>
<td>$116,392</td>
<td>$1,662,736</td>
<td>$375,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 1</td>
<td>$2,169,453</td>
<td>$579,814</td>
<td>$420,186.39</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$555,218</td>
<td>$514,235</td>
<td>$1,169,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Street 2</td>
<td>$2,570,547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1A</td>
<td>$4,714,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 1 B</td>
<td>$2,041,185</td>
<td>$279,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1,619,311</td>
<td>$121,884</td>
<td>$1,741,195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. 5th Pump Sta.</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Labor*</td>
<td>$2,399,400</td>
<td>$100,600</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,860,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$930,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/E Contracts</td>
<td>$1,593,000</td>
<td>$418,500</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$851,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$279,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage VI-1</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage VI-2</td>
<td>$3,650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-3</td>
<td>$2,455,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V-2</td>
<td>$9,814,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Mitigation*</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage Ill Remediation</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping 2</td>
<td>$1,737,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Station 2</td>
<td>$9,475,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$8,882,714</td>
<td>$937,286</td>
<td>$10,820,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,700,422</td>
<td>$1,152,273</td>
<td>$8,852,695</td>
<td>$4,658,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This wetland mitigation is being done on project lands.

### Burr Street Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burr Street Budget</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Engineering and Design</th>
<th>Construction Management</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Available Fed</th>
<th>Required Fed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4,840,000</td>
<td>$484,000</td>
<td>$363,000</td>
<td>$5,687,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$2,987,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Fed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,440,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ENTRY INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR CONTINUING MAINTENANCE SERVICES FOR PUMP STATIONS CONNECTED WITH THE FEDERAL LITTLE CALUMET RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND RECREATION PROJECT.

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation organized pursuant to IC 36-9-25 et seq., and The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, organized pursuant to IC 14-13-2 et seq. are political subdivisions or governmental entities empowered by the Interlocal Cooperation act, as amended to contract on behalf of each other on a basis of mutual advantage so as to better provide public services and facilities all under the authority of IC 14-13-2-18(9) and IC 36-9-25-10(14); and

Whereas, The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission is a public body corporate and politic of the State of Indiana capable of entering into and fulfilling the requirements of a nonfederal interest (as defined by 42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b); and

Whereas, The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, has presented an agreement which provides for a perpetual easement to be granted by the Town of Highland as Grantor, to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission as Grantee, in support of the rehabilitation of the 81st Street Pump Station and Fifth Street Pump Station, all to be completed in association with the US Army Corps Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project; and

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation organized pursuant to IC 36-9-25 et seq., as a political subdivision of the State, may, upon the terms and conditions that the proper authorities of the Town and the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission consider reasonable and appropriate, lease, lend, grant, or convey to the commission, at the commission’s request, real or personal property, including an interest in the property, owned by the entity that is necessary or convenient to achieving the purposes of IC 14-13-2, all pursuant to IC 14-13-2-14; and

Whereas, The Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation has authorized, approved and granted and ratified such a perpetual easement on the property herein described, related to the rehabilitation of several Pump Stations; and

Whereas, The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission now desires to enter into an agreement pursuant to IC 14-13-2-18(9) and IC 36-9-25-10(4), with the Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation, to provide for the design, construction and the continuing maintenance of certain improvements made in consequence of the construction to the 81st and Fifth Street storm water and waste water pumping stations.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission:
Section 1. That the Agreement for the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Pumping Station Improvements in the Town of Highland, Indiana between the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and the Town of Highland, through its Department of Public Sanitation and by its Board of Sanitary Commissioners is hereby authorized, approved and adopted in all respects;

Section 2. That the Chairman of the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission is hereby authorized and permitted to evidence this adoption and execution of the agreement by affixing his signature to the agreement and any related documents in support of its carrying out its purposes; further, the Secretary is hereby authorized to attest the execution of said agreement by the Chairman;

Section 3. That a copy of the Agreement for the Construction, Operation and Maintenance of Pumping Station Improvements in the Town of Highland, Indiana shall be attached to this Resolution and incorporated herein by reference;

Section 4. That this Resolution shall take effect and be in full force and effect from and after its passage by the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission.

Duly passed, resolved and adopted by the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, this ______ day of ______________________, 20____.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN
DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

William S. Tanke, Chairman

Attest:

______________________________
Secretary
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
Contact: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
        Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project
        219-763-0696

BURR STREET LEVEE ON HOLD

Portage, IN – 30 July 2002

The Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission will hold its regularly
scheduled meeting this Thursday, 1 August 2002. Work study session is at 5 pm. Public meeting
is at 6 pm.

At last month's meeting Commissioners discussed the remaining state dollars available to
the flood project and the problems with funding the Burr Street Levee Phase 2.

A map was available that showed the differences in flooding before and after Phase 2 is
constructed. According to Executive Director Dan Gardner the Commission does not have the
funds to build Burr Street Phase 2 because the Basin Commission’s $2.5 million appropriation
was recalled to fund the state deficit.

"Burr Street costs are not creditable to the project," explained Mr. Gardner, "but the map
clearly shows the seriousness of the situation."

A meeting was scheduled with Gary Mayor Scott King for 19 July to discuss Gary’s
involvement in the construction of the Burr Street levee and drainage ditch from Colfax Avenue to
the Burr Street Pump Station along the Little Calumet River. Mr. Gardner will report the results
of that meeting at the Commission meeting on 1 August.

-30-
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 INDR 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 Leves 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
Illinois due solely to the construction of the NRCS Thorn Creek Reservoir. Discharges and water surface elevations at the Illinois-Indiana stateline based on Corps of Engineers and NRCS studies (circa 1985) are contained in Table 1, below. A copy of the memorandum from the November 22, 1985 is included with this letter.

Table 1 - Water Surface Elevation and Discharges for the 1st Event at the Illinois-Indiana Stateline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modeled Condition</th>
<th>NRCS Modeling</th>
<th>Corps Modeling</th>
<th>Difference (NRCS-Corps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow (cfs)</td>
<td>Stage (ft NGVD)</td>
<td>Flow (cfs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td>599.5</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>595.7</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 1994, the Chicago District completed a more comprehensive hydraulic analysis of the Little Calumet River watershed using an unsteady flow model (UNET). These detailed studies considered the design of a flow control structure within Indiana that would ensure that the Illinois guidelines agreed to after the 1985 meeting would be met. The control structure plus the channel and bridge improvements along the Little Calumet River result in assuring that flood peaks and overall flood volumes crossing into Illinois are not increased. The studies within Feature Design Memorandum 5 (Corps of Engineers, 1994) included stage, flow and volume comparisons at the Illinois-Indiana stateline for baseline conditions for both with and without the NRCS Thorn Creek project. These comparisons are contained in table 2 (reference tables A-13 and A-14, Appendix A, Feature Design Memorandum 5).
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>1,128</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>

1 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 Consoer, 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
Sandy & Dan,

This is to confirm our visit on the 30th at 1:00. The meeting will include Dan Gardner, Bill Tanke, Curt Vosti, Beth Compton, Jeff Vogl, and me. I have also invited Mark Lopez to join us if he is available.

Beth and Jeff would like to take a tour of the east reach. They do not need to see everything, but certainly a good 30 minutes should do it. A rough agenda for discussion will include:

- Mitigation
- Burr St
- FHWA / COE and creditable work
- Local contribution
- Operation & Maintenance
- Cost control & current overhead review
- Income
- Marina
- Disposal of surplus property

I will be out of the office tomorrow, but will try to give you a call in the morning. If not, we can touch base on Monday to discuss the agenda.

Thanks,
Sean

-----Original Message-----
From: Sandy Mordus [mailto:smordus@nirpc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2002 4:34 PM
To: Fahey, Sean
Subject: LCRBDC meeting on the 30th

Sean:

Just a quick e-mail to confirm your meeting here at 1:00 on Tuesday, July 30th. Dan has talked to attorney Lou Casale, Chairman Bill Tanke and Treasurer Curt Vosti and has confirmed their attendance. Dan will be calling you shortly to discuss this in further detail. See you on the 30th.

Sandy
Mitigation
COMMERCIAL BUSINESS DAILY ISSUE OF DECEMBER 20, 2001 PSA #3002 SOLICITATIONS

R -- IMPLEMENTATION OF PRAIRIE AND FORESTED WETLAND MITIGATION AT LITTLE CALUMET RIVER IN NORTHWEST INDIANA

Notice Date
December 18, 2001

Contracting Office
US Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago -- Military, 111 N. Canal, Suite 600, Chicago, IL 60606

ZIP Code
60606

Solicitation Number
DACW23-02-R-0009

Response Due
February 28, 2002

Point of Contact
Regina Blair, 312-353-6400, Ext. 1702, FAX 312-353-2156

E-Mail Address
US Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago -- Military (regina.g.blair@irc02.usace.army.mil)

Description
With this announcement, the Chicago District Corps of Engineers issues a Request for Proposals for the implementation of 155 acres of ecosystem restoration and 18 acres of ecosystem enhancement. The restoration portion will be located in T36N; R8W; S19 adjacent to the west side of Chase Street south of the Little Calumet River, and the enhancement portion in T36N; R8W; S13 in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of 29th and Hanley Streets in Lake County, Indiana. The work will constitute a partial fulfillment of mitigation requirements for a flood control levee project in northwest Indiana that follows the Little Calumet River from the Illinois-Indiana state line eastward to Interstate Highway 65. The Contractor will be responsible for the 1) acquisition of plant material, 2) site preparation, which will include hand clearing, mechanical clearing and grubbing, broadcast and selective herbiciding, earthwork and storm drainage system installation, 3) native seeding and tree planting, 4) installation of geotextile erosion control matting, 5) exotic species control, reseeding and replanting and 6) installation of such site furnishings as split rail fences, A-frame gates and bollards. The primary objective of the mitigation for this project is to restore and
maximize biodiversity and ecosystem function in each of the three mitigation units. Pro-
be evaluated based upon the following criteria, listed in descending order of importance:
1) Technical Capabilities, 2) Technical Approach, 3) Experience and 4) Price (with price
approximately equal to the combination of the other three factors). Selection will be made
upon best value to the Government. The Classification Code for this procurement is Not
Industry Classification System (NAICS) 561730 and is unrestricted to business size. The
Corps of Engineers intends to award a firm-fixed-price contract. The Request for Propos-
als is available by downloading from the INTERNET ONLY. The project specification f
Document Format (PDF) files and can be viewed, navigated or printed using Adobe Ac-
Minimum system requirements are a 486 based personal computer, Microsoft Windows
greater and 8 MB application RAM. Interested Offerors can download the Request for I
Package from Internet Site http://www.lrl.usace.army.mil/ebs by clicking on the appro-
solicitation number. The project will be available on the Internet on or about 14 January
proposal due date will be on or about 28 February 2002 at 4:00 p.m. local time. Requests
telephone, fax or email will not be honored.

Web Link
Army Single Face to Industry (http://acquisition.army.mil)

Record
Loren Data Corp. 20011220/RSOL005.HTM (D-352 SN5154X0)

Created on December 18, 2001 by Loren Data Corp. --- info@ld.com
MEMO

TO: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
FROM: Judy Vanos, Land Acquisition
DATE: 29 July 2002
SUBJ: Update on Hobart Marsh Mitigation

Hobart Marsh Mitigation: First two offers out by 16 September 2002

7/29/02 -- Appraisals assigned to appraiser to complete in three weeks.

8/19/02 -- Appraiser completes appraisals and submits appraisals to LCRBDC.

8/21/02 -- LCRBDC reviews and submits appraisals to Corps for Review.

8/26/02 -- Corps reviewer reviews appraisals in two to three weeks.

9/10/02 -- Corps reviewer returns approved appraisals to LCRBDC.

9/16/02 -- LCRBDC mails first offers for mitigation acquisition in Hobart Marsh.

Contact me if questions. Thanks.
Burr Street Betterment Levee
City of Gary Meeting
Burr Street Levee Completion
July 19, 2002

AGENDA

I. What Has Been Done to Date
   - Federal Dollars Spent - +$ 66,000,000
   - State Dollars Spent - + $16,500,000
   - Levees and Recreation Features completed from Burr Street to I-65

II. What Remains to be Done in Gary
    BURR STREET LEVEE STAGE II
   - Non Federal $’s Needed
     ➢ $130,000 - Land Acquisition
     ➢ $100,000 - Utility Relocation
     ➢ $1,900,000 - Cash toward contract
   - Federal construction total $3.6 million
   - Once funding is committed, FEMA can be petitioned to begin removing Gary from the floodplain.

III. The Dilemma
   - State Budget Director/Governor’s office has taken $2.5 million from 2001-03 appropriation for General fund budget shortfall
   - State Budget Director/Governor’s office has restricted use of Development Commission funds for creditable items only. Burr Street is classified as a betterment.
FHWA/COE and Creditable Work
CREDITED

Cash escrow -- construction $6,973,000
IDNR properties $1,225,000
Commission lands $1,766,229
Engineering/survey credit $ 760,829
Engineering/Real Estate costs-submitted $ 345,108
Utility Relocation (thru 1999) $ 922,011
Borrow Sites $ 144,910
Legal costs $ 576,002
Contract land acquisition credit $ 896,990

$13,610,079

CURRENTLY SUBMITTED/UNDER REVIEW
Administrative (by Sandy) $ 7,914

ELIGIBLE ADMIN CHARGES TO BE SUBMITTED $ 829,282

CREDIT SUBMITTED THAT WAS RETURNED
FOR FURTHER DOCUMENTATION
Commission lands $ 565,473

ADD'L LAND CREDIT SUBMITTED PENDING APPROVAL
7/29/02 $ 21,475

CREDITED
SECTION 104 $1,667,200

NON-CREDITABLE ITEMS
Base Capital invested $ 700,000
Burr Street escrow $1,703,000
Burr St. costs incurred $ 406,049
Misc. Betterment escrow $ 191,000
(Lake Etta & Deep River)
IDNR expenditures $4,715,650
Marina costs incurred $1,069,000
Lake Etta costs incurred $ 568,478

$9,353,177

TO BE RE-SUBMITTED
Borrow Sites (difference of what we submitted & what you credited) $ 35,040
Difference on Hohman Avenue pumping (Sec.104) of what they spent & what you credited $ 290,762

$325,802

DENIED CREDIT
Property Liability Insurance $254,591

COSTS NEEDING TO BE REVIEWED
Highway Bridge issue $ 7-8 million
Burr Street Betterment Levee $ 4.5 million

July 29, 2002
MEMO

TO: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
FROM: Lorraine Kray, Crediting Technician
DATE: July 29, 2002
SUBJ: Crediting Update – Commission Lands

The following is a breakdown of the crediting information you requested.

Credit returned for additional documentation (17 tracts)

- 8 Tracts waiting for title evidence
  (Met with Title Company to finalize
  complicated order 7/19/02)
  $477,837  *
- 5 Tracts waiting for appraisal
  $69,332  **
- 4 Tracts waiting for appraisal review by COE
  $18,304

Total of credit pending
$565,473

Remaining files to be credited - (192)

- Waiting for Appraisals to the 1990’s value
  (32 @ $1500 each)
  $48,000
- Waiting for updated title work
  (171 @ $325 each)
  $55,575
- Estimated land costs yet to be credited
  $1,776,371

Total estimated credit $2,445,419  ***

* Title Companies will not accept more than 5 orders for title work per week

** Currently we have 3 appraisers working. We assign them two (2) tracts each
and they request a 30 day turnaround. Upon receipt of the appraisal we then
forward it to the COE for their approval which can take 2 to 4 weeks.

*** Total estimated credit does not reflect the fees for recording of deeds, relocation
and other miscellaneous costs incurred in acquisition.
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
Local Contribution
MEMO

TO: Dan Gardner, Executive Director
FROM: Judy Vamos, Land Acquisition  
DATE: 29 July 2002
SUBJ: Update on Hammond/Highland/Munster Property Valuations

Hammond / Highland / Munster Property Values total $538,000. Possible donation to LCRBDC.

We hope to work with these communities and ask them to donate the land. This will be cost-saving and creditable to the project.

Hammond = $ 230,000 (appr. 124 acres x $ 1850 @ acre easement value)  
Highland = $ 280,000 (appr. 151 acres x $ 1850 @ acre easement value)  
Munster = $ 28,000 (appr. 15 acres x $ 1850 @ acre easement value)

Contact me if questions. Thanks.
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
219 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60604-1797

30 JUN 1988

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF
Planning Division

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

In accordance with Section 104 of the 1986 Water Resources Development Act, you requested by letter dated March 24, 1987 that credit be given to the Commission by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) for work that had been accomplished by local interests on the Little Calumet River, Indiana project. The Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), based upon the recommendation of the Office of Chief of Engineers, has granted a credit of $1,667,200. The creditable work meets the criteria established in ER 1165-2-29 (33 CFR 240) as being compatible integral work. The creditable work consists of the following features:

a. Excavation, under COE permit, of the channel between the Conrail Railroad and Chase Street for the amount of $270,000;
b. Dredging between Indianapolis Boulevard and Indianapolis Boulevard bridge for the amount of $64,800;
c. Reconstruction of the existing levee system between the State line and Hohman Avenue for the amount of $334,200; and,
d. Construction of a pumping station to replace the one at 173rd Street for the amount of $997,600.

You requested credit for items of lands purchased by the State of Indiana prior to project authorization, and recreation facilities. These items are not creditable under Section 104, but may be eligible for credit as items of local cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. David Hunter at (312) 353-6513.

Sincerely,

Jess J. Franco Jr.
LTC Corps of Engineers
District Engineer
Tuesday, July 23, 2002

Louis M. Casale, Esq.
Casale, Woodward & Bulis, LLP
Attorneys at Law
9223 Broadway, Suite A
Merrillville, Indiana 46410

Dear Lou:

I am writing in order to communicate to you that at its meeting of July 24, 2002, the Board of Sanitary Commissioners passed and adopted Resolution No. 2002-21: A Resolution Authorizing the Entry into An Agreement for Continuing Maintenance Services for Pump Stations Connected with a Federal Aid Flood Control and Recreation Project.

By its adoption, the Board approved and adopted the Agreement for the Construction, Operation, and Maintenance for Pumping Station Improvements in Highland, Indiana.

Enclosed, please find eight (8) originally executed copies of Resolution No. 2002-22 along with eight (8) executed counterparts for the agreement, signed by the proper officers of the Board of Sanitary Commissioners.

As we previously discussed, I hope that you will present this agreement to the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission for its consideration and favor. If adopted, please have its proper officers execute in the proper counterpart and return to me three (3) executed originals for our files.

Thank you, Lou, for patience and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Griffin, IAMC/CMC/CMFA
Clerk-Treasurer

Enclosures: (8)

C: Dave Cattan
Jim Pokrajac
John Bach
Operation & Maintenance
Cost Control

&

Current Overhead Review
**PROPOSED PRIORITIES FOR USE OF 2001-03 STATE BUDGET DOLLARS**

**15 MONTH SCHEDULE (May, 2002 thru August, 2003)**

Revised: July 29, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expended to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,761,439</td>
<td>Cash to draw upon currently available from the $3 million State Budget funds</td>
<td>$109,896.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $400,000</td>
<td>Administration costs (Jim Pokrajac, Judy Vamos, Lorraine Kray, Sandy Mordus, Lou Casale, Jim Flora)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,361,439</td>
<td>COE escrow payment due October, 2002 (7% Cash contribution)</td>
<td>$266,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $266,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,095,439</td>
<td>Estimate for mitigation costs (Figure ½ of $500,000 earlier committed. Needed for “good faith effort”)</td>
<td>$3,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 845,439</td>
<td>Burr Street acquisition committed. Offers in process.</td>
<td>$4,585.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 820,439</td>
<td>Kennedy Industrial Park property acquisition (VI-1) – (20 parcels)</td>
<td>$31,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 120,439</td>
<td>Utility relocation engineering money (VI-1 &amp; VI-2) – (approx. 16 relocates)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 45,439</td>
<td>Estimate of ongoing title work costs for crediting purposes</td>
<td>$30,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $45,439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>Items not included in budget</td>
<td>$114,340.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total expenditures to date as of 7/29/02 .......... $560,423.16**

Remaining monies available for drawdown as of 7/29/02 .......... $1,219,761

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- $378,000</td>
<td>Estimate of actual utility relocation work (VI-1 &amp; VI-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $70,000</td>
<td>Clean-up of remaining properties in East Reach &amp; East Reach Remediation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $50,000</td>
<td>Burr Street property acquisition costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $100,000</td>
<td>Burr Street utility relocation costs (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $1,900,000</td>
<td>Burr Street Phase 2 construction cost (Not creditable. Needs State consensus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- $2,498,000</td>
<td>Total commitments from $2.5 million in budget recision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Items not included in budget** ........ $114,340.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price of DC765 Willie Cusic (East Reach property)</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes on DC707 Lake County Treasurer (East Reach property)</td>
<td>$1,935.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price of DC786 Paul Allen (East Reach property)</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase price of DC752 Elijah Cole (East Reach property)</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording of deed for DC765 Lake Co. Recorder's Office (East Reach)</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering services Garcia LE for Stage III Remediation</td>
<td>$2,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering services Garcia LE for Stage III Remediation</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property liability insurance (Valparaiso Insurance)</td>
<td>$26,178.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIND cost of replacing copper ground wire DC59</td>
<td>$57,782.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIND cost of fencing around open pit area DC59</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal notice publications for farm property – Post Tribune</td>
<td>$16.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal notice publications for farm property – Times</td>
<td>$17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ&amp;E utility relocation cost at SIV-1S</td>
<td>$2,008.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward &amp; Monica Johnston – Acquisition of DC483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Uniform Land Offer already out)</td>
<td>$9,686.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Plumbing – Removal of Taborski garage SIV-1N</td>
<td>$3,742.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$ 3,000,000  - Approved for drawdown on 7/26/01
   -234,379  (Marathon #49 draw)
$ 2,765,621
   -104,093  (In house draw #50)
   -70,550  (In house draw #51)
   -227,272  (draw #52)
$ 2,261,528  (draw #53)
   -54,000  (draw #54 - $46,000 last 2 draws + $18,000 payback escrows
      const. only – no Burr Street)
$ 2,307,728
   -34,650  (In house draw #55)
   -350,000  (draw #56)
$ 1,979,016  (draw #57)
   -52,095  (In house draw #58)
   -40,958  (In house draw #59)
$ 1,885,963  (draw #60)
   -38,054  (In house draw #61)
$ 1,847,909  (draw #62)
   -34,599  (In house draw #63)
$ 1,813,310  (draw #64)
   -33,124  (In house draw #65)
$ 1,780,186  (draw #66)
   -18,747  (draw #67)
$ 1,761,439  (draw #68)
   -91,244  (draw #69)
$ 1,670,195  (draw #70)
   -12,384  (draw #71)
$ 1,657,811  (draw #72)
   -266,000  (draw #73)
$ 1,391,811  (draw #74)
   -26,179  (draw #75)
$ 1,365,632  (draw #76)
   -27,344  (draw #77)
$ 1,338,288  (draw #78)
   -25,322
$ 1,312,966
   -4,586
$ 1,308,380
   -17,232
$ 1,291,148
   -21,695
$ 1,269,453
   -49,692
$ 1,219,761
FEDERAL FUNDING HISTORY

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Appropriations</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76 &amp; 76-77</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78 &amp; 78-79</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80 &amp; 80-81</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 &amp; 82-83</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Cigarette Tax Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1983-84 &amp; 84-85)</td>
<td>$1,768,800</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Breakwater Construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84 &amp; 84-85</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(General purposes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86 &amp; 86-87</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88 &amp; 88-89</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90 &amp; 90-91</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 &amp; 92-93</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94 &amp; 94-95</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96 &amp; 96-97</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Build Indiana Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98 &amp; 98-99</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00 &amp; 00-01</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Build IN Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02 &amp; 02-03</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
<td>Build IN Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(- 2,500,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Appropriations

**Received to Date**

$27,200,000

($28,968,800 including breakwater monies)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castle and Clinic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67th and Briley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prien Area A, Subdivision</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Street West</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Street East</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC, Average Subdivision</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buell Oak Woods (WAL)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadena</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (north half)?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WA, WS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (south half)?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanborn Estates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLHF Radio Int., Lot 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCMH Radio Inc., Lot 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEF Average Subdivision</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WA, WS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM (north tract)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM (middle tract)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM (south tract)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemidji (West tract)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemidji (East tract)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pincus</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandlot</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldall</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Sail</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tracts b/w. 55C &amp; 49B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. West of Sarney</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrole</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Hollow</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson-Atlas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozsiu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shubert Area Average Sub.</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>IA, WS</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 of 2 11 December 2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Mitigation Type</th>
<th>Soil Type(s)</th>
<th>% Hydrologic Soil</th>
<th>No. Hydrologic Soil Acres</th>
<th>Hydrology: Support forested wetland type?</th>
<th>Hydrology: Support forested wetland type?</th>
<th>Soils: Support forested wetland type?</th>
<th>Soils: Support forested wetland type?</th>
<th>Proximity to active plant diversity</th>
<th>Adjacent special areas</th>
<th>Potential for habitat diversity</th>
<th>Invasive exotic species presence</th>
<th>Mitigation DNK Req</th>
<th>Meets IDEM Req</th>
<th>Mitigation Cost Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must Bear, (Men's unit)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Bk, Mo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must Bear, (Women's unit)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk, (~20%)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Bk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Prop.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk, Blk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza (W. Men's)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza (S. Men's)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Berlin Church</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed. Fres. Acreage Sub.</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed. Fres. Acreage Sub.</td>
<td>31 Acre Fringe</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bla, Blk, Wt</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed. Fres. Acreage Sub.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy Church</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Sub.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-continuous Sub.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bla, Blk</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key to Soil Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom silt loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom silt loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom silt loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bk = Broom loam (0-35% slopes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1) Hydrologic soils are in boldface type, soils with inclusions are understated.
2) Mitigation cost ranks estimate from 1 (least expensive) through 2 (most expensive). See accompanying explanation.
3) The mitigation and restoration surveys at Spangler are estimates.
4) Conditional upon acquisition of parcels that will make "Conditional" parcels contiguous. Otherwise suitable.
5) Cannot be made contiguous with main mitigation area, but can be contiguous with each other. Otherwise suitable.
Income
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CASH POSITION - JANUARY 1, 2002</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHECKING ACCOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX FUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RECEIPTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - JUNE 30, 2002</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEASE RENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEREST INCOME (FROM CHECKING &amp; FIRST NATL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC. INCOME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KRBC REIMBURSEMENT RE: TELEPHONE CHARGE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCEEDS FROM VOIDED CHECKS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CW#7254 N. NIMETZ</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RECEIPTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DISBURSEMENTS - JANUARY 1, 2002 - JUNE 30, 2002</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 EXPENSES PAID IN 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER DIEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL &amp; MILEAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; ADVERTISING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDS &amp; INSURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE EXPENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING EXPENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND ACQUISITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITIES/PROJECT MAINTENANCE SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONS SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND MANGEMENT SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEYING SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC MARKETING SOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; STRUCTURE COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVING ALLOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY &amp; STRUCTURES INSURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITY RELOCATION SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRUCTURAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK CHARGES MERCANTILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCRBDC MONEY MARKET PAYBACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CASH POSITION - JUNE 30, 2002</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHECKING ACCOUNT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAND ACQUISITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INVESTMENTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST NATIONAL BANK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE CAPITAL INVESTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700,000.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NATIONAL BANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BASE CAPITAL INVESTMENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258,000.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISC INTEREST/RENTAL INVESTMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MISC MONEY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MARINA SAND MONEY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(STATE DRAW MONEY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GARY PARKS &amp; REC MONEY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INVESTMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESCROW ACCOUNT INTEREST AVAILABLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUSTOMER RECEIPT
Not Negotiable

First National Bank, Valparaiso, Custody Services Unit

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6100 Southport Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage, IN 46368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Banas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 MV118.19

| Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission | PRINCIPAL: $258,000.00 |
| 6100 Southport Rd | RATE: 3.00/3.02 APY% |
| Portage, IN 46368 | INTEREST: $3,859.39 |
| Kim Banas | TERM: 182 days |
| | SETTLEMENT DATE: 4/26/02 |
| | DUE DATE: 10/25/02 |

Disclosure Notice

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

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

Additional Required Disclosure Notice

The (seller) is not permitted to substitute other securities for those subject to this agreement and therefore must keep the (buyer's) securities segregated at all times, unless in this agreement the (buyer) grants the (seller) the right to substitute other securities. If the (buyer) grants the right to substitute, this means that the (buyer's) securities will likely be commingled with the (seller's) own securities during the trade day. The (buyer) is advised that, during any trading day that the (buyer's) securities are commingled with the (seller's) security, they may be subject to liens granted by the (seller) to third parties and may be used by the (seller) for deliveries on other securities transactions. Whenever the securities are commingled, the (seller's) ability to resegregate substitute securities for the (buyer) will be subject to (seller's) ability to satisfy any lien or to obtain substitute securities.
Money Market Account 3285 – Special Funds of $1.5 million ($1,500,055 actually deposited)
Account opened 10/19/00
Balance as of July 29, 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 July 29, 2002 - Current Balance $292,527.45

Interest earned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month, 2001</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January, 2001</td>
<td>$ 777.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2001</td>
<td>$1,467.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2001</td>
<td>$1,520.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2001</td>
<td>$1,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2001</td>
<td>$1,403.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2001</td>
<td>$1,311.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 2001</td>
<td>$1,090.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2001</td>
<td>$ 669.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2001</td>
<td>$ 648.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2001</td>
<td>$ 789.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>$ 667.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2001</td>
<td>$ 640.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2002</td>
<td>$ 577.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>$ 494.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2002</td>
<td>$ 514.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>$ 489.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2002</td>
<td>$ 492.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2002</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 July 29, 2002 - $155,055.24

2 lease options with LEL:

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

- $72,732 was paid out to Don Walsh & Assoc. for playground equipment at Charles Agnew Handicapped Park on 8/8/01
- $4,300 was paid out to Precision Lawn Care for O&M on 11/13/01
- $2,180 was paid out to South Shore Marina (beaver dam removal) for O&M on 5/6/02
- $26,178.50 was paid out to Valparaiso Insurance Professionals (land liability insurance) on 5/17/02
  (Subsequently, it was paid back into the account on 6/14/02 when state draw was received.)
- $1,313 was paid out to South Shore Marina (O&M) on 6/13/02
- $329 was paid out to Don Powers Inc. (property insurance for Gerry Street rental) on 7/15/02

Interest earned:

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

Interest money earned $3,901.44
Money Market Account 0573 – Sand money  
Account opened 11/16/00  
Balance in account as of July 29, 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</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November, 2000</td>
<td>$ 285.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2000</td>
<td>$ 578.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2001</td>
<td>$ 555.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2001</td>
<td>$ 460.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2001</td>
<td>$ 477.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2001</td>
<td>$ 425.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2001</td>
<td>$ 440.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2001</td>
<td>$ 411.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 2001</td>
<td>$ 411.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, 2001</td>
<td>$ 412.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2001</td>
<td>$ 373.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2001</td>
<td>$ 325.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November, 2001</td>
<td>$ 256.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2001</td>
<td>$ 233.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 2002</td>
<td>$ 210.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>$ 180.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2002</td>
<td>$ 187.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>$ 177.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2002</td>
<td>$ 179.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2002</td>
<td>$ 172.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest money earned $6,755.36
## 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount varies with acres farmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only interested farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase Street Farm Stand</td>
<td>$1,700 per month</td>
<td>$20,400</td>
<td>Current agreement since June 18, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Towers (Includes Ameritech)</td>
<td>$1,400 per month</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>Current lease since July 5, 2000 – July 5, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Increase every 5 years based on Metro Chicago Consumer Price Index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkheimer</td>
<td>$2,400 per year</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>Current lease since December 24, 1991 for $200/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No escalation clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking on 2.05 acres east of their building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike &amp; Melinda Adams</td>
<td>$300 per month</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td>Current lease since May 3, 2000 (No escalation clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LAMAR signs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #1050</td>
<td>$600 per year</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>West side of Grant – ½ mile south of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3475</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant – South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign #3480</td>
<td>$3,300 per year</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>West of Grant – South of I-80/94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL YEAR LEASE INCOME** $56,900
Marina
PORTAGE PUBLIC MARINA
1200 MARINA WAY
PORTAGE, IN 46368
219-763-6833
FAX: 219-764-9903

July 8, 2002

Estimated 2001 Income and Expenses review:

Income:
- Slip Rentals: 199,817.00
- Transient Slips: 5040.00
- Pump Outs: 965.00
- Ramp Fees: 40,955.00
- Ship Store: 3350.00
- Sales Tax: 135.00

Total Income: 250,262.00

Expenses:
- Legal: 187.00
- Salaries: 53,233.00
- Supplies: 15,527.00
- Contractual: 151,618.00
- Equipment: 18,234.00
- Sales Tax: 135.00

Total Expenses: 238,934.00

Employees expenses will drop by 25% due to City paying employees,

Portage Marine Management will no longer receive $10,000.00 yearly for contractual running of marina,

$15,308.00 was posted to wrong account,

$15,500.00 purchase of new marina truck,

$2734.00 purchase of new lawn care equipment,

Total non-adjusted income is $11,328.00
Total adjusted income is $26,636.00
Total adjusted income with major purchases included, $44,870.00
Disposal of surplus property
22 July 2002

Mr. and Mrs. Mike Adams
3120 Gerry Street
Gary, IN 46406

Dear Mike and Melinda,

RE: Disposition of the 3120 Gerry Street Property.

Thank you for speaking with me today about purchasing the 3120 Gerry Street property that you are currently renting. As we have previously discussed the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission was interested in selling the property but had to go through the state disposition of property procedure to be in compliance with regulations.

The procedure is now complete and the Commission at its public meeting on 9 July 2002 voted to put the property on the open market for the appraised price of $36,000 and offer you the first chance to purchase the property. It was also agreed that no time limit is or will be imposed on you as you make your decision and investigate purchasing or financing possibilities. As I stated in our conversation I will contact the Calumet Township Assessor to determine the probable property taxes for 2002 and call you with the information.

You have been exceptionally good tenants and I personally appreciate your loyalty to the project and patience in waiting for this opportunity.

Please call me if you have questions about this letter, the property, or the sale. I send my thanks for your cooperation.

Respectfully,

Judith (Judy) Vamos
Land Acquisition Agent
Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission

6100 Southport Road
Portage, Indiana 46368

(219) 763-0696 Fax (219) 762-1653
E-mail: littlecals@nirpc.org

July 24, 2002

Mr. Dale Cobble
BERKHEIMER COMPANY, INC.
2910 West 85th Street
Gary, Indiana 46401

Dear Dale:

As per your telephone conversation with Jim Pokrajac on Tuesday, July 23rd, we would like to pursue with you the potential for selling some of our surplus land to Berkheimer. We have just completed the necessary steps with the State of Indiana that would allow us the option of selling surplus property and we have now received authorization to dispose of any surplus property we own.

We currently have an agreement with you for approximately 2 acres of land to the east of your building that you use for parking. In past conversations, we understand that you might also be interested in purchasing land west of your building to allow for expansion of your facilities. Could you please respond back to us to let us know how much acreage Berkheimer would be interested in purchasing from the Development Commission? For your convenience, I have enclosed a sketch showing the property we own in that area, also showing the location of our permanent levee easement to your north that we need to keep to operate and maintain our flood control project. If you are interested in extending your request to your north up to that permanent easement line, please let us know. You may use this sketch to mark up and dimension the lands you are interested in and return this to us.

Upon receipt of your response, we will review this with our Board of Commissioners and get back to you. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me at the above number.

Sincerely,

Dan Gardner
Executive Director

Lou Casale, LCRBDC attorney
Arlene Colvin, LCRBDC
Jim Pokrajac, LCRBDC
Environmental and
Social Analysis Branch

Mr. Larry D. Macklin
Director
Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Executive Office
402 West Washington Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dear Mr. Macklin,

Enclosed you will find the mitigation plan for the Little Calumet River, Indiana, Local Flood Protection and Recreation Project. This plan grew out of several meetings with your staff, particularly Mr. Bill Maudlin and Mr. Tom Post, in which the role of forested wetlands in Little Calumet watershed ecosystems, as well as the difficulty of accomplishing good mitigation within hydrologically disturbed landscapes, was discussed. We are interested in any comments you may wish to provide on this plan.

This plan recommends providing a substantial portion of the required mitigation outside of project lands in the Hobart area. An important component of the Hobart area portion of this plan is that it will connect three existing, important natural areas, including a 65 acre wet savanna tract owned and managed by the local not-for-profit Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund, Hobart Prairie Grove owned by the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and the McCloskey Savanna, which is under the jurisdiction of your Division of Nature Preserves.

The portion of the mitigation which falls within the project limits will be implemented on project lands and will be maintained by the non-Federal sponsor, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission. However, the lands proposed for mitigation in the Hobart marsh area fall outside the jurisdiction of the non-Federal Sponsor under the applicable Indiana enabling statutes and outside the authority of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to acquire as part of the project. Therefore, we will be seeking a capable third party or parties to acquire these lands, establish the ecosystem and maintain the established mitigation in exchange for a fee for these services. Because of the vagaries of negotiating for lands and establishing restoration needs our ability to commit to specific time frames for finalizing the entire plan is limited.
We have had preliminary discussions with Mr. Bill Maudlin and Mr. John Bacone regarding this plan. Our preference is to have the IN-DNR Division of Nature Preserves as the third party, particularly since you are adjacent land owners. However, if you determine that your agency should not serve in that capacity, we would like to know if the IN-DNR would consider acting as the beneficiary of a reversionary clause in the land deeds, as well as of construction and management funding, and thus guarantee the responsibility of the selected mitigation contractor. The reversionary clause would serve to insure that the State of Indiana can protect itself in perpetuity against the failure of this party to maintain the ecosystem which will have been created.

In addition, we hope the IN-DNR will agree to work with the COE to create and serve on a management committee that would make unified management decisions on behalf of the mitigation lands, adjacent IN-DNR lands (McCloskey Savanna) and, if deemed appropriate, any other adjacent natural areas. Parties and lands to be included in such a management consortium would be mutually agreed upon by the COE, the Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission and by the adjacent natural area landowners, including IN-DNR, the Heinz Fund and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Such an area would be treated as a macrosite which would facilitate environmental, economic and other benefits to be derived from such a management strategy.

We expect that the IN-DNR will have detailed questions concerning both the limits and extents of its responsibility, and will also have specific expectations with respect to the qualifications of the third party. Criteria which we believe will significantly increase the ability of the third party to carry out this mitigation plan include:

- natural area management as their principle focus;
- the demonstrated ability to acquire the land in question without condemnation, together with the willingness to do so for this project (note: payment for mitigation services will not be made by COE until the third party has first documented its land ownership or option to buy and has contractually agreed to implement the mitigation);
- the demonstrated ability to implement ecological restorations;
- ability to meet performance standards as established by the COE, in consultation with the IN-DNR, the design contractor and with the third party itself;
- ability to manage the land in perpetuity according to the dictates of the COE as advised by the IN-DNR and other adjacent landowners;
- ability to perform ongoing management strategies, including prescribed burning, brush clearing, judicious herbicide use and deer control;
ability to hire staff, enter into contracts and to make land management decisions quickly.

If there are additional criteria that you think are important enough to be required of any third party organization before you would agree to accept such a reversionary clause, please add them to this list.

We hope that you will respond soon with any comments. If you are interested, we would appreciate the opportunity to meet in the near future to discuss details. If you have any questions at all, please feel free to call Greg Moore of my staff at 312/353-6400, ext. 2019.

Sincerely,

Paul Mohrhardt
Chief, Planning Division

cc:

Mr. John Bacon, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Nature Preserves
Ms. JoMary Crary, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water
Mr. Dan Gardner, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission
Mr. Bill Maudlin, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Marty Maupin, Indiana Department of Environmental Management
Ms. Liz McCloskey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mr. Ken Smith, Indiana Department of Natural Resources, Division of Water
11 December 2000

Environmental and
Social Analysis Branch

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

RE: Results of an interagency evaluation of potential properties to determine their suitability as mitigation lands for impacts incurred by the Little Calumet River flood control project.

Dear Mr. Gardner,

On 27 and 28 September 2000, representatives of IN-DNR, IDEM, USFWS and USACE visited and evaluated several tracts of land to determine their suitability to mitigate for the impacts of the Little Calumet River flood control project. The results of that evaluation are shown in the accompanying two-page table.

The assigned mitigation cost rank is based upon 1) the compatibility of hydrology and soils to the plant community types to be restored, 2) to the proximity of natural areas, high quality habitats or areas holding native plant diversity, 3) to the presence of on site or adjacent native seed banks and 4) to the presence of on site or adjacent invasive/exotic weed species. The assumption here is that mitigation on appropriate soils and hydrology near existing high quality habitat in the absence of a significant invasive/exotic species problem will be inherently more stable and will lead to significantly reduced costs of both implementation and perpetual maintenance. In fact, several of the tracts listed on the table are showing oak and graminoid community reproduction.
During this field meeting, two contradictory agency requirements became apparent. While all, or virtually all, of the soils in the Hobart Marsh area are predominantly wet, not all of those soils are hydric. While IDEM requires that hydrology be restored to a certain number of acres of hydric soil, IN-DNR requires a specific number of acres of oak dominated forested wetland plant communities, which will not succeed on hydric soil.

As a solution to this dilemma, IDEM recommended rewetting a number of acres of hydric soils near the Little Calumet River in order to satisfy their hydric soil requirement. This could be accomplished by breaking field tiles, plugging drainage ditches or notching existing privately constructed levees, between Chase and Grant Streets for example, or in some other suitable area. IDEM requires no additional planting or stewardship. Meeting this requirement will permit the planting of the oak dominated forested wetland required by the IN-DNR in the non-hydric soils at Hobart.

The precise acreage requirement will arrive soon under separate cover from IDEM, who assured us that the number will not exceed, or even approach, the approximately 195 acres in the agricultural field located between Chase and Grant Streets.

Thank you for all of your assistance, Dan. If you have any questions, please call Greg at 312/353-6400 extension 2019.

Sincerely,

Original Signed
Philip R. Bernstein
Chief, Planning
DESCRIPTIONS OF SOIL TYPES

Blunt silt loam (B1A)

On this soil, runoff is slow, and the erosion hazard is slight. Included with this soil in the mapping are small areas of gently sloping Morley silt loam on slightly elevated rises and of Pewamo silt loam in depressions. Also included are small areas of a soil that is mostly gray near the surface. The major limitation is wetness, but it can be overcome by establishing and maintaining an adequate drainage system.

Bono silty clay (Bn)

This soil occurs on broad, depressional flats in the old Chicago Lake Plain area. Included with this soil mapping are small areas of nearly level Milford silty clay loam. Wetness is the major limitation. Because Bono silty clay remains wet until late spring, field operations are delayed. Bono soils have high available moisture capacity and organic matter content. The water table is at or near the surface in spring.

Del Rey silt loam (De)

Included with this soil mapping are small areas where the surface layer is loam. Also included are small areas of nearly level Milford silty clay loam, Del Rey silt loam-dark colored variant, and Bono silty clay. Wetness is the major limitation. Surface runoff is very slow or ponded; and internal drainage is also very slow.

Elliott silt loam (El)

Included in this soil mapping are small areas of Markham silt loam that have slopes of less than 2% and of Pewamo silty clay loam in depressions. Also included are small areas of Markham silt loam—2-6% slopes. Other inclusions are some areas where Elliott silt loam is eroded and other areas where it has slopes of more than 2%. Runoff is slow and the erosion hazard is slight. Wetness is the major limitation. An adequate drainage system is needed to remove excess water.

Linwood muck (Lm)

Included with this soil mapping are small areas where muck is less than 42 inches thick over clay, sand or marl. Also included are areas where the surface layer contains silty material washed from eroded slopes. Other inclusions are in areas where the muck is deeper than 42 inches. A high water table is the main limitation. Runoff is very slow or ponded. A suitable drainage system is needed to remove excess water for agriculture, but an adequate outlet is often difficult to establish. This soil type is subject to wind erosion if the surface layer becomes dry and is not protected by cover
Marsh (Mh)

Marsh (Mh) occupies shallow lakes and ponds that may be dry during years of less than normal precipitation. Most areas of Marsh, however, remain wet all year. Cattails, rushes, sedges, willows and other water tolerant plants grow abundantly on Marsh, and these areas are well suited to wildlife. Marshes provide refuge for wild fowl, and muskrat and mink find habitat in the larger marshes.

Maumee loam fine sand (Mm)

The Maumee series consists of deep, very poorly drained, course-textured and medium-textured soils. These soils are on broad, depressional outwash plains. Maumee soils formed in course-textured outwash material. Typically the surface layer is black loamy fine sand about 16 inches thick. The subsoil, about 23 inches thick, is mottled with grayish-brown and dark gray. The upper 5 inches of the subsoil is black loamy fine sand. The lower part is light brownish-gray fine sand. Maumee soils are high in organic matter content and natural fertility and have good tilth. These soils have low available moisture capacity. Permeability is very rapid, and surface runoff is very slow. Because these soils have a high water table in spring, a suitable drainage system that combines open ditches, tiles and water table control structures is needed if crops are to grow well. Maumee loamy fine sand (Mm) has a profile described as typical for the series.

Milford silt loam overwash (Mo)

This soil has a profile similar to that described as typical for the series, except that the surface layer of this soil is silt loam instead of silty clay loam. It is underlain by silty clay loam of clay loam glacial till or lacustrine material. The silt loam extends from the surface to a depth of 8 to 20 inches. Included with this soil mapping are small areas where the dark colored layer extends to a depth of 28 inches. Also included are areas of Del Rey silt loam, Pewamo silt loam and Rensselaer loam. Wetness is the major limitation, and an adequate drainage system is needed for agriculture.

Morley silt loam, 2-6% slopes (MuB)

This soil lies along drainage ways and streams or on small knolls and is deep, moderately well drained and medium to moderately fine textured. Typically, the surface layer is silt loam about 8 inches thick. The uppermost 6 inches is dark grayish brown, and the lower part is brown. The subsoil extends to a depth of 44 inches and has a few small pebbles scattered throughout. The uppermost 7 inches is firm, yellowish-brown silty clay loam. The middle is very firm, yellowish-brown silty clay mottled in the lower part with grayish-brown. The lower 17 inches of the subsoil, mottled with yellowish and brownish colors, is grayish-brown, very firm silty clay that grades to firm silty clay loam. The subsoil is strongly acid to a depth of 27 inches, is slightly acid at that depth and is moderately alkaline below a depth of 36 inches. Morley soils have high available moisture capacity.
Morley silty clay loam, 6-12% slopes (Mvc3)

This soil lies along drainageways or in depressions. It has a profile similar to that described for the series except that erosion has removed most of the surface layer and, in places, some of the subsoil. The plow layer consists mostly of yellowish-brown silty clay loam from the subsoil and remnants of the original grayish-brown surface layer. The depth to limy silty clay loam is about 20 inches.

Oakville-Tawas complex, 0-6% slopes (OkB)

This complex consists of very poorly drained and excessively drained soils that are formed in organic materials and in sandy mineral soil materials. The soils in this complex have strongly contrasting properties. The complex is about 45% Oakville fine sand and about 45% Tawas muck. The rest consists of included areas of Maumee loamy fine sand and gently sloping Oakville fine sand. The acreage extends in the same general direction as the shores of Lake Michigan and is characterized by a pattern of long, narrow, parallel ridges and sloughs. The alternating strips are 100 feet wide. The excessively drained Oakville fine sand is on the elongated ridges, and the very poorly drained Tawas muck is in the sloughs. The major hazards on the higher elevations are droughtiness and soil blowing because the Oakville soils are low in organic matter content, have very low available moisture capacity and are very rapidly permeable. The major limitation in the depressions is wetness. In about half the acreage of the complex, the soils area stabilized by trees and grasses. The rest of the acreage is grassy marsh.

Pewamo silty clay loam, calcareous variant (Pe)

This soil is in the depressions of the Little Calumet River. Included with this soil mapping are small areas that have a loam surface layer; areas where there is a thin layer of loam or fine sandy loam in the subsoil; and small areas of nearly level Rensselaer loam, Milford silty clay loam, Pewamo silty clay loam and Del Rey silt loam. Wetness is the major limitation. A suitable drainage system is difficult to establish because outlets are not adequate in most places.

Pewamo silty clay loam (Pe)

This soil is nearly level or depressional occupying swales, narrow drainageways and broad flats. Included with this soil mapping are small areas of nearly level Elliott, Markham, Blount, and Morley lilt loams. In some areas bordered by eroded soils, there is a silt loam mantle 6 inches thick. Also included are areas of marsh. Wetness is the major limitation. Runoff is very slow or ponded in the more level areas, but medium or rapid in the narrow drainageways where the adjacent soils are gently to moderately sloping. Most areas are cultivated, though a few remain in trees.
Rensselaer mucky loam, sandy substratum (Rr)

The Rensselaer series consists of deep, poorly drained, medium textured soils. These nearly level or depressional soils occur on lake and outwash plains. They formed in moderately fine textured lacustrine deposits or glacial outwash underlain by interbedded fine sand and silt. Typically, the surface layer is black and about 14 inches thick. The uppermost 10 inches is loam and the lower part is clay loam. This soil (Rr) occupies the lowest depressional areas of the glacial outwash plain north of the Kankakee River. It has a profile similar to that described as typical for the series except that from 8 to 12 inches of muck is on the surface while the underlying material, at a depth of from 40 to 60 inches, is fine and course sand mixed with fine gravel. The profile of this soil also differs in that it contains more sand than is typical. The major limitation to agriculture is wetness. A suitable drainage system is difficult to establish because outlets generally are not adequate. Runoff is very slow or ponded, and internal drainage is very slow.

Warners silt loam (We)

The Warners series consists of deep, very poorly drained mineral soil over marl. These soils are on depressional lake plains. Warners soils formed in 16 to 40 inches of medium-textured mineral soil material over highly calcareous marl. In a typical profile the mineral soil material is silt loam about 16 inches thick. The uppermost 7 inches is black while the lower part is very dark gray. The mottled underlying material is gray marl about 14 inches thick. Below the marl at a depth of 30 inches is mottled light gray marly fine sand. Warners soils are high in organic matter content and available moisture capacity. Surface runoff is very slow to ponded. Permeability of the marl is slow. Wetness is the major limitation to agricultural use, and crops cannot grow well on these soils if management does not include a suitable drainage system. Because Warners soils are in low-lying areas, drainage outlets are difficult to establish.

Watseka loamy fine sand (Wk)

The Watseka series consists of deep, somewhat poorly drained, course-textured soils. These soils are generally nearly level and occur on outwash plains. Watseka soils developed in medium acid to neutral, sandy material derived from glacial drift that has been reworked by wind. Included with this soil mapping are areas where the surface layer is dark gray to brown fine sand or fine sandy loam. Also included are small areas of Maumee loamy fine sand, Gilford fine sandy loam and Wauseon fine sandy loam that are all nearly level.

Watseka loamy sand, moderately deep variant (Wl)

Included with this soil in mapping are small areas where the surface layer is fine sandy loam that is dark gray to grayish brown. Also included are areas of Brady fine sandy loam, Watseka loamy fine sand and Wauseon fine sandy loam. Wetness is the major limitation. This soil is well suited to cultivated crops if adequately drained.
Wauseon fine sandy loam (Wo)

 Included in this soil mapping are small areas where the surface layer is loam or loamy fine sand that is dark gray to grayish brown. Also included are areas of Maumee loamy fine sand, Gilford fine sandy loam and Watseca loamy fine sand. Wetness is the major limitation. Because of the high water table, this soil is not suited to deep-rooted plants.

LITERATURE CITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liitle and Close</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Fe, We</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th &amp; Hankey</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Mn, We</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj, Area Ac. Subtotal</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Street West</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Mn, We</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Street East</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>We</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRL, Average Subtotal</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst Oak Woods (W.E.)</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bi, Mo, Fe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedano</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Co, Mn, McC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (north half)*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bi, Co, Mn, McC</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangler (south halfr*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bi, Co, Mn, McC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Estate</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Mo, Fe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLTH Radio Inc. Lot 4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLTH Radio Inc. Lot 5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Bi, Mo, Kr</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHEF, Average Subtotal</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe, Ma, Mn, McC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonk (North tract)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonk (Middle tract)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Ma, Mn, MoE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noonk (South tract)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Mo, Fe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit (West tract)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benoit (East tract)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettman</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdale</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Ma, Mn, McC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiddler</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Fe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colt SAR</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bi, Ma, Mn, McC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atricks betv. Mo &amp; 49*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Ma, Mn, McC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout West of Security</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Mn, Fe</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prine</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Mn, Fe</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quill Hollow</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bi, Mn, McC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon-Dulhan</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Mn, Mn, Mn, McC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zepinkis (S. 3% of parcel)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bi, Mn, McC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart Area Acrage Sub.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 of 2

11 December 2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass (Part of Mass group)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx, Mf</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Trust</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx, Mf</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx, Mf</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Property</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx, Mf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garza (W-Hwy)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia (W-Hwy)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bethel Church</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx, Mf</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold, Feb. Access Road</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calf Creek</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contiguous Mountain</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Bk, Fx</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Soil Types
- Bk = Bluestem silt loam (0-2% slopes)
- Bc = Boco silt clay
- Bm = Marius silt loam fine sand
- Du = Del Rey silt loam
- H = Elliott silt loam
- La = Linwood mud
- Ma = Marsh soil
- Mi = Milford silt loam overwash
- Mu = Merkay silt loam (0-2% slopes)
- Mv = Merkay silt loam (1-12% slopes)
- Qb = Oakville-Tavas complex (0-4% slopes)
- Pt = Pemmso silt loam
- Pr = Pemmso silty clay loam, calcareous variant
- Rm = Reisenhofer mucky loam, sandy substratum
- Wk = Waukesha loamy fine sand
- Wh = Waukesha loamy sand, moderately deep variant
- Ws = Waukesha fine sand loam

Notes:
1) Hydrologic soils are in boldface type, soils with light face are uncertain.
2) Mitigation cost ranking estimate from 1 (least expensive) through 6 (most expensive). See accompanying explanation.
3) The enhancement and restoration acreages at Sparks are estimates.
4) Customized upon the acquisition of parcels that will make "Conditional" parcels contiguous. Otherwise suitable.
5) Cannot be made contiguous with main mitigation area, but can be contiguous with each other. Otherwise suitable.

2 of 2 11 December 2000
August 10, 2001

Mr. Greg Moore
Corps of Engineers, Chicago District
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, IL  60606

Re: Little Calumet River Levee Project
Habitat Mitigation

Dear Mr. Moore:

This letter is a follow up to the July 9th conference call between you and staff of the Division of Water, Division of Fish and Wildlife, and Division of Nature Preserves regarding the habitat mitigation plan for the Little Calumet River Flood Control and Recreation Project. I would like to reiterate some of the issues that were discussed.

I understand that the COE is finalizing the revisions to the Conceptual Habitat Mitigation Plan that was prepared in 1998. It was discussed in the July 9th conference call that the submitted plan could be general in nature with respect to the specific mitigation tracts that have not yet been purchased. The mitigation plan can simply state that detailed plans for these tracts will be prepared for bid contracts and will be reviewed by our Department.

As a reminder, the approved permit for construction in a floodway for the east reach of the project, FW-16,167, requires in-kind wetland replacement at the following ratios: 1:1 for scrub/shrub wetlands, 2:1 for emergent wetlands, and 3:1 for forested wetlands. In previous meetings it was agreed that the scrub/shrub wetland impacts could be mitigated with emergent wetlands, and up to 25% of the forested wetland impacts could be enhancement, rather than restoration, but at a 5:1 ratio.

As you are aware, DNR requirements for wetland mitigation may differ from IDEM requirements. Please contact IDEM directly to verify their requirements for this project.

In addition, because the local sponsor cannot purchase lands outside the project area, the local sponsor will need to work with a third party to facilitate off site mitigation. DNR would consider acting as the third-party back up for land management on tracts that may fall within DNR’s mission.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Ms. Jonary Crary, Water Resource Planner, with the Division of Water at 317-232-4160 or the Division’s toll free number 877-928-3755 (1-877-WATER55).

Sincerely,

Paul J. Ehret
Deputy Director

PJE/MWN/JC

pc: Dan Gardner, LCRBDC
Real Estate Division

SUBJECT: Mitigation Land Acquisition

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

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

**Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund Tracts**

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

**Hobart Area Tracts**

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

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

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

FOR THE COMMANDER

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

Attachments

Copy Furnished:
Louis M. Casale, Esq.
Imad Samara, PM-PM
Greg Moore, PM-PS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CHICAGO DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
111 NORTH CANAL STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60606-7296

14 January 2002

Planning Branch

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

RE: 2 January 2002 letter from Deputy Director Timothy J. Method discussing the procedure for meeting the IDEM Little Calumet River project mitigation hydric soil requirement.

Dear Mr. Gardner,

It has come to my attention that you profess to be confused by the procedure, outlined in the enclosed letter from IDEM, to meet hydric soil rehydrating requirements for the Little Calumet River mitigation project. Even though the IDEM letter does it quite clearly, let me explain that process to you once again.

After acquisition work is completed at Hobart, all hydric soil acres less than the 400 acre mitigation requirement imposed by IDEM will be accommodated by returning wetland hydrology to a number of acres equal to that shortfall. This accommodation will occur in the 198 acre agricultural field located in the project area between Chase and Grant Streets south of the Little Calumet River. For example (and this is only an example for the sake of simplicity), if we were to acquire 400 acres of mitigation land at Hobart, 300 of which held hydric soil, we would be responsible for returning wetland hydrology to 100 acres between Chase and Grant Streets. The rewetted hydric soil acres will require neither planting nor stewardship, but will be delineated and monitored to assure that the appropriate number of acres has been properly hydrated.

The above is in full consonance with the requirements and expectations of both IDEM and IN-DNR.
I know that IDEM telephoned you personally to explain this procedure to you prior to mailing the 2 January 2002 letter. You mentioned to a member of my staff twice at your office during the month of December 2001 that you had received that telephone call and that you understood the hydric soil requirement. That requirement, upon which completion of the flood control project is contingent, will not disappear over time.

I would remind you as well that both the IN-DNR and the National Park Service, at an 18 December 2001 meeting in your office and in your presence, have agreed to assist in any way possible, within the constraints of their respective agencies, with the acquisition of mitigation land for this project. A 2 January 2002 letter to that effect from the IN-DNR is enclosed. With these resources available to you, I see no legitimate reason to delay mitigation land acquisition any longer.

In summary, the requirements of the project are clear. But if you do have further questions, I encourage you to call Greg Moore of my staff at 312/353-6400, extension 2019.

Sincerely,

Philip Bernstein
Chief, Planning Branch

**Enclosures:** 2 January 2002 letter from IDEM Deputy Director Timothy J. Method. 2 January 2002 letter from IN-DNR Deputy Director John M. Davis.

**Copies Furnished:**

Honorable Peter J. Viscloski
Governor Frank O’Bannon
Commissioner Lori R. Kaplan, IDEM
Director Larry D. Macklin, IN-DNR
Mr. Imad N. Samara  
Department of the Army  
Chicago District, Corps of Engineers  
111 North Canal Street  
Chicago, IL 60606-7206

January 2, 2002

Dear Mr. Samara:

We have reviewed your letter, dated December 7, 2001 regarding the Indiana Department of Environmental Management’s (IDEM) position on the proposed Little Calumet River flood control project mitigation. IDEM will accept the restoration and enhancement of hydric soils to create high quality wetlands within the Hobart Marsh area as mitigation for wetlands impacted by the levee construction. The creation of high quality wetlands adjacent to high quality uplands will create a unique and valuable natural area that will benefit not only the aquatic resources of northwest Indiana but also the State of Indiana as a whole. However, IDEM can only accept restoration and enhancement on hydric soils against the 400 acres of mitigation required for the project, but it in between the levees or in the Hobart Marsh area. For example, if the Local Sponsor acquires 600 acres of land within the Hobart Marsh area for restoration and enhancement but only 300 acres consists of hydric soil, IDEM would still expect 100 acres more of restoration and enhancement of hydric soils to meet the 400 acre mitigation requirement. IDEM would recommend the restoration and enhancement of hydric soils between the levees as an option of making up the difference. Because the area between the levees would be regularly inundated with high waters from the Little Calumet River, which carries the seeds of aggressive plants such as reed canary grass, cattail, phragmites, and cottonwood, IDEM believes the seeding of the area with more conservative plants to create a higher quality wetland would be futile. IDEM expects only the breaking of tile, filling of drainage ditches, and/or other techniques to restore hydrology, with monitoring and delineation to determine if the areas are successfully restored to wetland.

If you have any questions please contact Mr. Marty Maupin, Project Manager, at 317/233-2471.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Gray for Tim Method

Timothy J. Method  
Deputy Director  
Indiana Department of Environmental Management

cc: George Bowman, IDNR  
Dan Gardner, LCRBC  
Don Ewoldt, LEL  
Miriam Dant, Baker and Daniels  
Phil Bernstein, USACE
January 2, 2002

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

Dear Mr. Gardner:

I was pleased to learn that there is significant progress being made regarding the startup of the Hobart Marsh mitigation project. As you know, the Department of Natural Resources has been committed to providing assistance in whatever way we can. While you continue to explore ways to cooperate with other partners on some of the needed mitigation acreage, I'd like to follow up on the progress made at the December 18, 2001 meeting, which was attended by staff from the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Little Calumet River Basin Development Commission, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund, and the Indiana Department of Natural Resources.

The Department of Natural Resources would like to offer our land acquisition assistance on certain parcels within the Hobart Marsh Project Area. These parcels are adjacent to land owned and managed by the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (Kim, Cedano, and 3 parcels owned by Nozrik – see attached map). We would like to take LCRBDC up on the offer of the services of Judy Vanos to contact landowners and negotiate with willing sellers to get the tracts ready for acquisition. Her assistance is especially relevant since she is already working with one of the owners (Nozrik) on another tract within the Little Calumet floodplain. Since you now have some funds available for this purpose and if Judy can get the parcels ready, we are offering to furnish the necessary documents, take title, and hold them in the short term. The National Lakeshore is willing to commit to the eventual ownership and management of these parcels, if they receive the necessary authorization, and we would plan to transfer these lands to them once they were able to accept them.
We are all excited by the possibility of actually getting started on this important mitigation project. As you continue to negotiate with other partners and further implement the mitigation plan for this area, please let us know when we can be of assistance.

Sincerely,

John M. Davis, Deputy Director

CC: Jeff Viohl, Office of the Governor
     Honorable Peter J. Viscloskey
     Dale Engquist, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
     Ron Trigg, Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund
     Colonel Mark A. Roncoli, Corps of Engineers
     Imad N. Samara, Corps of Engineers

Attachment: map
19 February 2002

Planning, Programs
and Project Management Division

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

RE: Hobart area mitigation land acquisition.

Confidential - Do Not Release

This letter contains confidential and highly sensitive information and should not be released to anyone without our express permission. You are expected to take all prudent steps to safeguard this letter and prevent its disclosure. Unauthorized release of the information in this letter could adversely affect this project by (1) providing third parties with an unfair competitive advantage and (2) by unduly increasing project costs.

Dear Mr. Gardner,

Table 1 below shows that our total Little Calumet River flood control project mitigation obligation is 400 acres. Eighty-nine acres of mitigation have been designed and are scheduled for implementation during the coming spring and summer, leaving 311 acres to be acquired in the Hobart Marsh area.

Table 2 shows specific Hobart Marsh area tracts, together with tract sizes in acres. Also shown are the number of acres of hydric soil per tract and the hydric soil deficit per tract for the purpose of meeting the IDBM wetland soil rehydration requirement.
Acquisition of the tracts identified as Key Tracts in Table 2 will provide 277 acres of mitigation land and a hydric soil deficit of 156 acres. This leaves 34 acres left to get in order to meet our 311 acre obligation. This can be accomplished by choosing from the properties in the Additional Tracts section of Table 2. The Price tract (17 acres), the Mandon-Julian tract (15 acres) and the tract west of Skomac between 49th Street and McCloskey Savanna State Nature Preserve (4 acres), present an additional 36 acres and an additional hydric soil deficit of 23 acres. The grand totals, then, are 313 acres of Hobart mitigation land and a 179 acre hydric soil deficit that will be easily accommodated in the 198 acre agricultural field located between Chase and Grant Streets south of the Little Calumet River.

Please feel free to contact us if you have questions or need assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ray Coughenour
Deputy District Engineer
### Table 1: Little Calumet River project mitigation obligation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Locations</th>
<th>Mitigation Acres by Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Area (by street)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Chase (Bk Oak)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark &amp; Chase (S)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Subtotals</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hobart Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage Subtotals</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Acreage Totals</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Table 2: Potential Hobart area tracts for mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract (^1)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tract Size (Ac)</td>
<td>Hydric Soil Acres</td>
<td>Hydric Soil Deficit</td>
<td>Mitigation Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozrik (north)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozrik (central)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nozrik (south)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berndt (west)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berndt (east)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frohman</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundalo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faddell</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Tracts:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract(^2)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S of McS, Skomac</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S of McS, W of Skomac</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandon-Julian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** 1/ Some tracts may have fewer acres available for mitigation than shown due, for example, to owners wishing to retain homesteads.

2/ McS = McCloskey Savanna State Nature Preserve.
14 May 2002

Planning, Programs and Project Management Division

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

RE: Request that you make available to the Little Calumet River Flood Control Project the property between Chase and Grant Streets south of the Little Calumet River.

Dear Mr. Gardner,

We ask that you make available to the Little Calumet River flood control project the approximately 198 acre field located between Chase and Grant Streets south of the river. The purpose is to return wetland hydrology to hydric soil in order to meet the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) 401 water Quality Certification requirements. As you know, construction of the west reach half of the project cannot proceed until 401 water quality certification has been met.

Several times in the past you have expressed the concern to me and others that the Commission could be forced to repay rent received from the Lake Brie Land Development Company (LEL) should the Commission terminate its lease to LEL. A legal review by our Office of Counsel and Division of Real Estate showed no clause in your lease agreement with LEL requiring you to repay rent received should you exercise your right to terminate without cause. That review showed only the requirement that you reimburse the Licensee for the appraised value of any improvements to the property made by them. There have been no improvements to the property we are asking you to make available to us. Accordingly, the agreement would not, in our opinion, expose you to any liability with regard to rental payments.
As my staff has discussed with you previously, we are willing to consider any lands that you would care to submit as an alternative to the property we request here so long as they meet project and IDEM requirements. In the absence of a suitable alternative, we will consider Chase/Grant to be the preferred plan and will move forward with it.

For your information, I have enclosed a topographic map and an aerial photo with boundaries showing our requirement, together with three copies of DA Form 1959 that show control point locations. Please call if we may provide you with any additional information.

Sincerely,

Ray Coughenour
Deputy District Engineer

Copy Furnished:
Mr. Louis M. Casale

Enclosures:
Two figures showing location of requested property.
DA Form 1959 showing locations of three (3) control points.
LITTLE CALUMET RIVER PROJECT
WETLAND MITIGATION UPDATE MEETING
10:30 WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14, 2002
COMMISSION OFFICE

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Statement of Meeting Purpose

2. Brief Historic Review – How we got to where we are today
   - Initial COE plan – In-project lands
   - Consulting contract by COE with Dr. Gerould Wilhelm
   - Hobart Marsh directive following “Mitigation Matrix”
   - LEL lease/option on corridor lands
   - Shirley Heinze Environmental Fund involvement – Withdrawal
   - IDNR/LCRBDC agreement for Hobart Marsh acquisition
   - Current status of lands available for mitigation

3. Current Position of each Agency regarding Mitigation Requirements

4. Current Issues Potentially Impacting Mitigation
   - LEL option lease extension
   - Phase II stormwater rules

5. Questions by Commissioners and Discussion

6. Statements/Questions from the Floor

7. Schedule – Next Steps