> To: "Kevin A. Shaffer" <kevin-s@haegerengineering.com>
>
> We must meet to go over these comments. I can stop by tomorrow to review and formulate. These comments seem over the top and we may never get a project.
>
> Roland Sachs, Jr.
> Superintendent of Roads
> Palatine Township Road District
> 530 N. Smith Street Palatine, IL 60067
> p.: 847.358.6336 f.:847.358.4056
> www.palhwy.com
>
> On Feb 22, 2012, at 3:52 PM, "Kevin A. Shaffer" <kevin-s@haegerengineering.com> wrote:
>
>> Roland,
>>
>> Based on IDOT comments, it appears there are additional items that IDOT wants and some question on the selected Hy-Span three sided precast structure and also using a proprietary manufacturer (Hy-Span or approved equal) without having a separate structural engineer, which we are not, as it would preclude Hy-Span from bidding. As we previously discussed, it s disappointing that some of these items are just coming up now for the first time especially when this has been an ongoing project with CCHD since 2009 when you started working with them looking at the repair costs and replacement options, re-alignment, etc. and also when we met with IDOT BLR to discuss the project and what we were doing.
>>
>> We reviewed the IDOT Comments received via email from John McNelis on 1/27/12, and offer the following item-by-item commentary for discussion purposes in order to draft a response:
>>
>> 1. Need proposed structure number. We need this for tracking and before approval, so please get proposed before sending in transmittal. Page ix of the SIP Manual indicates: For new bridges, the structure number is to be issued and assigned for inclusion in ISIS no later than submittal of preliminary Bridge Design; or Type, Size and Location (TS&L) plans for Central Office approval.
>> The proposed structure # is 016-3999 per separate email provided by John McNelis.
>>
>> 2. Please verify proposed Letting date; shown as of April 1, 2011. April 1, 2012 is pushing schedule given comments.
>> Date will need to be adjusted based on comments, IDOT process & additional requirements as well as ESR and fact meeting will not be scheduled till March 14th (as previously mentioned, I can t attend on the 14th, as Len, Todd and myself have to attend a 2 day conference to maintain our CFM, so I contacted John and asked him to reschedule to another date and his response was the meeting can t be rescheduled). We submitted the ESR and uploaded the attachments to the IDOT FTP site. You can download PDFs of the submitted application and attachments for you records from there. To access IDOT FTP Site go to ftp://ftp.dot.il.gov/pub/ (User Name: public, password: idot). The uploaded files are located in a folder called Briarwood Lane Section 10-25151-90-BR ESR in the District 1 folder.
>>
>> 3. BCR and Estimate of Cost included, but these are not required; BCR not required for non-Federal Aid replacements.
>> Per the meeting we had with Brandon Buzzell at IDOT BLR and follow-up email from him on April 29, 2011 which PTRD was cc d, he stated an abbreviated BCR including cost estimate should be included in the submittal which is why it was prepared and submitted. We would have not known anything about this if we were not specifically directed to prepare and include it in the submittal.
>>
>> 4. Asbestos Form BLR 10220 included. OK.
>> No response required.

>>
>> 5. Hydraulics our approval will be contingent on the issuance of a Floodway Permit either by your office or by the Schaumburg IDNR Office of Water Resources.
>> Seems like there is some question as to who will issue permit for work in floodway (CCHD or IDNR). CCHD s previous comment 5 in their December 9, 2011 Memo from John McNelis stated provide status of IDOT Local Roads Floodway permit, while this comment from IDOT says CCHD or IDNR/OWR.
>>
>> 6. Verify increase in created head from 0.10 feet to 0.17 feet. That may be an issue in the Hydraulic review.
>> Based on modeling that was result for 100 year event (<0.1 typically allowed). Modeling shows higher 100 yr BFE elevation than FEMA approved FIS 100 Yr BFE (709.77) for existing (709.94) and proposed (710.01) models, this goes back to initial modeling that was done, that you worked on, that yielded slightly higher elevations than FIS that was noted as conservative in the report. We did not change the elevation of the centerline of the road below the FEMA approved BFE of 709.77, so flows over the road at elevations at and less than the FEMA approved 100yr BFE elevation are identical. The open area of the proposed structure is greater than the existing. The part that causes a problem is that there is some change in the elevation of the road above the FEMA approved BFE elevation (lower than modeled 100 yr) as the centerline profile of the road was raised over the proposed structure as was discussed. The modeled higher 100 year water surface elevation is what is causing the issue at the raised road elevation over the proposed bridge. There is not a lot that can be done except for possibly modifying the road profile or making the proposed opening larger. We can possibly also look at recalibrating the models some to possibly get the water surface elevations closer to the FEMA approved 2008 FIS elevations, but you spent a lot of time on this already doing this and the previous models were given out already to others. If the water surface is at or below FEMA approved 100 Year FIS Elevation of 709.77, I am pretty confident that the proposed structure and over road flow can carry about the same or slightly greater flow than the existing condition as the centerline of roadway overflow profile below 709.77 was designed to generally match that of the existing centerline roadway overflow profile and we have a slightly larger open area without any inner walls to catch debris and block flow for the proposed structure. I do not think we should do anything yet, except respond to the comment and see what comments are received from the hydraulic review.
>>
>> 7. This project involves construction of a 3-Sided Precast Concrete Structure. The design and shop drawing review should therefore follow the guidelines contained in Bridge Manual Subsections 2.3.11 and 2.3.11.4 and the current Guide Bridge Special Provision GBSP 15, which should be included in the special provisions. LRFD design (HL-93 design vehicle) is required.
>> Plans, Notes, BLR Form and other items will need to be revised to utilize LRFD HL-93 design vehicle loading (instead of HS-20 Loading that was used for past culvert projects we did for the township). Structural engineer will need to design to this new standard (based on my quick research the HL-93 is not that much different than the HS-20). The Bridge Manual can be downloaded here: http://www.dot.state.il.us/bridges/brmanuals.html. GBSP 15 can be downloaded here: http://dot.state.il.us/bridges/gbsp.html. I have not gone through all these items yet in any detail, but we already have a modified version of GBSP 15 on Sheet 3 of the plans as well as additional notes on Sheet 18 of the plans. The plans that may need to be changed back to IDOTs original special provision. Based on other comments, issue is that it does not allow for proprietary manufacturer s to be specified even if or approved equal has been specified. See comments 9 & 10 for additional information.
>>
>> 8. Indicate Span and Rise of the 3-sided structure on the Form BLR 10210.
>> Will need to add span and rise to BLR Form 10210. Span is 40 . We will need to get some clarification on where to count dimension from for the rise, since a pedestal was proposed on top of the footing that the precast structure would sit on based on discussions with Hy-Span due to height/size/weight considerations. BLR 10210 will need to be revised accordingly.
>>
>> 9. Our office will not being reviewing the submitted plans. However, the Plan sheets have Hy-Span base sheets. The construction documents cannot refer to proprietary items. I believe inclusion of the proprietary sheets would preclude Hy-Span from being able to bid on the project.
>> Plans utilized Hy-Span (or approved equal) and we utilized their structure geometry and other information provided from them as was discussed. This is also how we did the previous projects we did for the Township. We also included

their sheets at the end of the plans for reference only. It appears now, possibly due to funding sources/IDOT involvement, that you can t refer to any specific manufacturer, even if approved equal is specified, and also can t incorporate Hy-Span drawings for reference as per comment that would preclude Hy-Span from bidding which they obviously would not allow. Specifying a product/manufacturer, or approved equal, is done all the time on publically bid projects (not sure specifically on projects bid out by IDOT). Possibly we can just remove the references to Hy-Span (utilize IDOT approved three sided precast manufacturer) and also remove the Hy-Span sheets at the end of the plans that were included for reference purposes. Specifying Hy-Span, or approved equal, as the three-sided concrete structure manufacturer/type was not meant in any way to preclude other three-sided precast concrete structure manufacturers from being used as long as they are an IDOT approved proprietary system, meet required design loads, are within the required dimensions and have a hydraulically equivalent waterway opening, are constructed of specified materials and similar aesthetic look, and are of quality equal to or better than specified. Possibly a note similar to this could be added to the plans to further clarify that other manufacturer s besides Hy-Span can be used. We could also specifically list the other IDOT approved manufacturers that are listed in GBSP 15 (See Item 10). The project will be competitively bid so the contractor would want to get the best price possible for the bridge so they can be the low bidder so I do not really see how specifying Hy-Span or approved equal would impact this. Based on comment 10, they seem to want a structural engineer now during the design phase. See commentary for item 10 for additional related commentary.

>>

>> 10. Who is the consultant s structural engineer? Expect they may use a cast-in-place concrete footing. If so, design should accommodate worst case of the approved fabricators provided in GBSP 15. If use Hy-Span s structural engineer, also precludes Hy-Span from bidding on project.

>> As noted for item 9, we utilized Hy-Span or approved equal, as was discussed and how we did previous projects we did for the Township. Hy-Span provided various information that was used to develop the plans. Hy-Span would not provide any structural design if it precludes them from bidding on the project, so given comments 9 & 10, I am inferring that they want a separate structural engineer consultant to design various structural items (footing, pedestal, etc.) using worst case of all the approved fabricators provided in GBSP 15. I too expect the footing and pedestal required for the Three sided precast structure to be cast-in-place. It seems like they want the structural design done before bidding which would require a structural engineer now instead of having the contractor to take care of using the selected three sided precast manufacturer s structural engineer or another hired by the contractor to prepared required structural drawings and calculations for all components after the project is bid.

>>

>> 11. Will cofferdams be needed for construction?

>> Yes. Cofferdams were shown on plans and I can t see how the work can be done without them. Notes indicate that the Contractor will be required to submit an in-stream/side-stream work plan including cofferdams, dewatering activities, etc. for approval by the USACE prior to performing any in-stream/Side-stream work.

>>

>> 12. The three-sided structure foundations are very near the existing culvert foundation locations. This may not be avoidable for this design, but will likely result in more structure removal. We will add a note to our eventual approval. Please note that the locations of the proposed foundations appear to be at or near the existing substructure locations. Care must be taken during construction to locate existing substructure elements to prevent damage or conflicts with the substructure locations. If conflicts arise and modifications are required of the design shown on the plans, the Structural Engineer of record should be notified for approval of revisions.

>> The location of the proposed foundations to the existing was noted before and there really are not many options given the site constraints if a three sided structure is utilized. This note can be added to the revised plans.

>>

>> 13. Assume there is a desire for the aesthetics of a three-sided structure at this location. We would expect a single span pile bent spill thru with riprap protection, possibly with a cast-in-place concrete slab superstructure, to be significantly more economical and could avoid existing foundation. The cost is about $320/SF for the proposed design for structure only.

>> Options looked at were discussed and it was decided to proceed with a Hy-Span 3-sided precast structure (or approved equal) as box-beam/free-span options you previously looked at and discussed with CCHD could not meet clearance requirements given the existing site constraints. We also discussed in meeting we had at IDOT BLR with

Brandon Buzzell. I am not all that familiar with the bent pile spill thru abutment substructure (cast-in-place cap supported by driven piles with the spill through abutment with riprap scour protection) with cast-in-place slab superstructure or the cost, but since it appears a separate structural engineer may be required during the design phase, it might be an option to consider if it saves money and can avoid the existing foundation. I assume that there would be issues with clearance for this type just like there was for the box beam/free span options you investigated before while you were still here.

>>

>> 14. Please verify zero degree skew. Based on the plan sheets, appears a 15 right would better match the geometry and channel.

>> Skewing structure was previously discussed and it was decided to put proposed structure in same location and orientation as that of the existing structure, since the existing structure opening is so much wider than creek skewing seemed to create more grading and channel transition work than if it was just kept at 0 degree skew as proposed.

>>

>> 15. Need Scour Critical Evaluation Coding Report, as noted in BLRS Circular Letter 2009-07, Bridge Scour Supplement , issued March 31, 2009. Scour analysis for closed abutment type structures such as this is not expected to be as reliable as for open abutment types. Therefore need to look at the history, borings and flow velocities. The second page of the Form BLR 10210 indicates: Scour protection shown on plans was based on Scour Protection Detail provided by Hy-Span Bridge Systems . and sufficiency will be reviewed by designer at time of structure design . This riprap treatment appears to be acceptable for this location given the borings. The riprap is a protective measure, and will provide a means for early detection of scour problems. In addition, according to policy (Bridge Manual 2.3.6.3.2) they should provide a Scour Design Table on the plans. Please include that on the TS&L Type submittal, as well as riprap details.

>> We have not designed scour protection before for a precast bridge structure, so we deferred to Hy-Span for their recommendation and showed based on detail that we received from them as was discussed. Existing structure did not show evidence of scour and comment indicates scour protection detail on the plans should be acceptable given the borings. Based on this comment it appears a TS&L (Type, Size and Location) type submittal will need to be prepared and submitted including the riprap details and scour design table (see item 16 for more information). A scour design protection table will need to be added to the plans. See item 16 for additional commentary.

>>

>> 16. Need to include TS&L Type submittal and a Plan & Profile sheet. There is a Plan & Profile sheet included in the plans, but we will not be reviewing those and these sheets must be part of the PBDHR file. In addition, we do not accept full size sheets, so ask that these sheets be submitted on 11 x 17 .

>> We have not done a TS&L submittal before and this was not done for any of the previous projects that we did for PTRD. Per comment, TS&L and plan & profile must be done on 11x17 sheets as part of the PBDHR submittal. Information on TS&L can be found in Section 2.3 of the Bridge Manual. Based on this comment I assume that a separate TS&L with P&P s on 11x17 sheets will need to be prepared and submitted. An example of a TSL drawing can be found here: http://www.dot.il.gov/bridges/Design%20Guides/TSL_EX16.pdf. I believe much of information required by the TS&L is basically already contained in the plans. I do not know if they are OK with the P&P s contained in the plans and they just want 11x17s of them, possibly with larger font per comment 17, to even look at as they said they will not be reviewing those.

>>

>> 17. The font used on the plans should be legible. Currently the text size is too small to read when printed on the 11x17 sheets, which are commonly used for review and construction. Please consider following IDOT drafting standards and adjust the font type and size.

>> Font used on plans is very legible when printed at full size. It appears they want us to revise font size and possibly type to be more legible at 11x17. I printed a full set of plans at 11x17 and albeit a little small, I can still read everything without using a magnifying glass. It is a good amount of work to change this now.

>>

>> 18. After review and cost, curious what the impetus is for replacement? A lot of money. Replacement structure is similar in many ways to the existing as far as length and size.

>> Based on CCHD repair cost, age of structure, existing roadway approach alignment to bridge and other factors, PTRD decided to pursue complete structure removal and replacement versus repair of the existing structure. I do not know if

this means they would just like to see repair done at this time in-lieu of complete replacement or if they want repair costs and other structural replacement options reviewed again. In terms of the replacement structure being similar to the existing structure. The replacement structure allows for a clear roadway width of 27 over the bridge while the existing roadway width over the existing bridge is only about 20-21 (very narrow). Also, the proposed structure also has a slightly larger open area with no interior walls for debris to get stuck on and obstruct flow which has been a problem with the existing structure in the past (reason why single span/free span options were investigated). In addition the roadway is being re-aligned to provide a better approach alignment to structure, which is very poor right now.
>>
>> 19. Also would like to know who is serving as the NBIS Program Manager for this structure.
>> Based on a quick online search, NBIS appears to stand for National Bridge Inspection Standards. The Program manager is responsible for supervising operation for compliance with all NBIS requirements. The requirements of the Program Manager are located in the Bureau of Bridges and Structures Services Manual Section 3.6.2.3 as well as BLR Bridge Inventory and Inspections Manual (http://www.dot.il.gov/blr/manuals/Chapter%2006.pdf). There are extensive experience/qualification/certification requirements to qualify to be an NBIS Program Manager. From BLR/BIIM Section 6-3.2(b): All local agencies (LAs) having responsibility for a structure in the NBIS must designate an Agency PM to ensure compliance with the NBIS and to provide guidance and management of their bridge inventory. If an LA does not have an employee who is qualified, they may hire a consultant to serve as their PM. If IDOT District personnel perform the NBIS inspections for an LA, the District or Region Bridge Maintenance Engineer (BME) will serve as the Agency PM. The BME should ensure the qualifications and provide oversight of the personnel for such structures in the District/Region. Given this I am not sure who is serving NBIS Program Manager for this Structure? Possible CCHD or a separate Consultant?
>>
>> After you have had a chance to review the above please contact me to discuss, so that we can formulate a game plan how you want us to proceed. I told John McNelis via email that an item-by-item response would be sent via email prior to the end of the week to give time for a response and come up with an agenda for the meeting on March 14th. Please also see email with commentary for discussion to CCHD comments. The above is just commentary for discussion purposes in order to help formulate a response. Did you want us to prepare the official item-by-item response email to their comments or do you want to take care of this? No matter which one of us prepares the other should review and comment before it goes out so we both are on the same page. We also need to decide if the email response should come from you or us, and to whom it should be sent (John actually forwarded the original comments he received from IDOT, so should it just go to him to distribute?).
>>
>> Please note that I am leaving the office now to do an inspection in the field and will not be coming back to the office today. As of know I plan to be in the office all day tomorrow and Friday.
>>
>> Thanks,
>>
>> Kevin A. Shaffer, PE, SIT, CFM, DECI
>> Principal
>>
>> HAEGER ENGINEERING
>> 1304 N. Plum Grove Road
>> Schaumburg, IL 60173
>>
>> Tel: 847.394.6600 x388
>> Direct: 847.230.3188
>> Cell: 847.812.8951
>> Fax: 847.394.6608
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: John McNelis (Highway) [mailto:john.mcnelis@cookcountyil.gov]
>> Sent: Friday, January 27, 2012 10:53 AM
>> To: rsachsjr@gmail.com

>> Cc: Kevin A. Shaffer; palhwy@aol.com
>> Subject: FW: Cook Co. Palatine Township SN 016-4000 (ex) Prop
>> 016-???? Sec 10-25151-90-BR
>>
>> Roland,
>>
>> Forwarding you IDOT's comments. In regard to comment one, we have put in a request to IDOT for assignment of new structure number. I will forward the number to you and Kevin Schaffer when we get it.
>>
>> John
>>
>> John McNelis
>> Cook County Highway Department
>> Project Engineer / Township Liaison, Drainage and Utilities Division
>> 69 W. Washington Street, 21st Floor
>> Chicago, IL 60602
>> Phone: 312-603-1834
>> _____
>> From: Haider, Zubair M [Zubair.Haider@illinois.gov]
>> Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2012 5:08 PM
>> To: Frank Williams (Highway)
>> Cc: John McNelis (Highway); Daniel Szwaya (Highway); palhwy@aol.com; Ahmad, Moud
>> Subject: FW: Cook Co. Palatine Township SN 016-4000 (ex) Prop 016-???? Sec 10-25151-90-BR
>>
>> Frank,
>> Please forward these comment to the Township. As discussed earlier we need to have a meeting with the Township to explain process and deliverables. We will also send a copy with letter.
>>
>> Thank you,
>> Zubair
>> From: Klein, James K
>> Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2012 5:00 PM
>> To: Haider, Zubair M
>> Cc: Humke, Matt
>> Subject: Cook Co. Palatine Township SN 016-4000 (ex) Prop 016-????
>> Sec 10-25151-90-BR
>>
>> Zubair: Received the BCR and PBDHR, etc. for the subject project earlier this week. We have not seen much if any work from the consultant, Haeger Engineering, Inc., in the past, and the submittal needs some work to bring it up to standards. We will try to limit their work, but comments are below and on the attached. And without running numbers, some concern about the economy of this structure. Please forward as appropriate, and copy me for our records. Appears Owner may needed to respond to some of the questions. We should receive a disposition/response to the comments, and ask that it be in electronic format (not .pdf) so that we can use conversation style before submittal of hard copy modifications. Thanks, Jim
>>
>>
>> 1. Need proposed structure number. We need this for tracking and before approval, so please get proposed before sending in transmittal. Page ix of the SIP Manual indicates: For new bridges, the structure number is to be issued and assigned for inclusion in ISIS no later than submittal of preliminary Bridge Design; or Type, Size and Location (TS&L) plans for Central Office approval.
>>

>> 2. Please verify proposed Letting date; shown as of April 1, 2011. April 1, 2012 is pushing schedule given comments.
>>
>> 3. BCR and Estimate of Cost included, but these are not required; BCR not required for non-Federal Aid replacements.
>>
>> 4. Asbestos Form BLR 10220 included. OK.
>>
>> 5. Hydraulics our approval will be contingent on the issuance of a Floodway Permit either by your office or by the Schaumburg IDNR Office of Water Resources.
>>
>> 6. Verify increase in created head from 0.10 feet to 0.17 feet. That may be an issue in the Hydraulic review.
>>
>> 7. This project involves construction of a 3-Sided Precast Concrete Structure. The design and shop drawing review should therefore follow the guidelines contained in Bridge Manual Subsections 2.3.11 and 2.3.11.4 and the current Guide Bridge Special Provision GBSP 15, which should be included in the special provisions. LRFD design (HL-93 design vehicle) is required.
>>
>> 8. Indicate Span and Rise of the 3-sided structure on the Form BLR 10210.
>>
>> 9. Our office will not being reviewing the submitted plans. However, the Plan sheets have Hy-Span base sheets. The construction documents cannot refer to proprietary items. I believe inclusion of the proprietary sheets would preclude Hy-Span from being able to bid on the project.
>>
>> 10. Who is the consultant s structural engineer? Expect they may use a cast-in-place concrete footing. If so, design should accommodate worst case of the approved fabricators provided in GBSP 15. If use Hy-Span s structural engineer, also precludes Hy-Span from bidding on project.
>>
>> 11. Will cofferdams be needed for construction?
>>
>> 12. The three-sided structure foundations are very near the existing culvert foundation locations. This may not be avoidable for this design, but will likely result in more structure removal. We will add a note to our eventual approval. Please note that the locations of the proposed foundations appear to be at or near the existing substructure locations. Care must be taken during construction to locate existing substructure elements to prevent damage or conflicts with the substructure locations. If conflicts arise and modifications are required of the design shown on the plans, the Structural Engineer of record should be notified for approval of revisions.
>>
>> 13. Assume there is a desire for the aesthetics of a three-sided structure at this location. We would expect a single span pile bent spill thru with riprap protection, possibly with a cast-in-place concrete slab superstructure, to be significantly more economical and could avoid existing foundation. The cost is about $320/SF for the proposed design for structure only.
>>
>> 14. Please verify zero degree skew. Based on the plan sheets, appears a 15 right would better match the geometry and channel.
>>
>> 15. Need Scour Critical Evaluation Coding Report, as noted in BLRS Circular Letter 2009-07, Bridge Scour Supplement , issued March 31, 2009. Scour analysis for closed abutment type structures such as this is not expected to be as reliable as for open abutment types. Therefore need to look at the history, borings and flow velocities. The second page of the Form BLR 10210 indicates: Scour protection shown on plans was based on Scour Protection Detail provided by Hy-Span Bridge Systems . and sufficiency will be reviewed by designer at time of structure design . This riprap treatment appears to be acceptable for this location given the borings. The riprap is a protective measure, and will provide a means for early detection of scour problems. In addition, according to policy (Bridge Manual 2.3.6.3.2)

they should provide a Scour Design Table on the plans. Please include that on the TS&L Type submittal, as well as riprap details.
>>
>> 16. Need to include TS&L Type submittal and a Plan & Profile sheet. There is a Plan & Profile sheet included in the plans, but we will not be reviewing those and these sheets must be part of the PBDHR file. In addition, we do not accept full size sheets, so ask that these sheets be submitted on 11 x 17 .
>>
>> 17. The font used on the plans should be legible. Currently the text size is too small to read when printed on the 11x17 sheets, which are commonly used for review and construction. Please consider following IDOT drafting standards and adjust the font type and size.
>>
>> 18. After review and cost, curious what the impetus is for replacement? A lot of money. Replacement structure is similar in many ways to the existing as far as length and size.
>>
>> 19. Also would like to know who is serving as the NBIS Program Manager for this structure.
>>
>> James K. Klein, P.E., S.E.
>> ----------
>> Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Bridges and
>> Structures Unit Chief - Local Bridges
>> 2300 South Dirksen Parkway
>> Springfield, Illinois 62764 phone: (217)782-5928
>> fax: (217)782-7540
>> e-mail: James.Klein@illinois.gov<mailto:James.Klein@illinois.gov>
>>

>>

Roland Sachs Jr.

From: John McNelis (Highway) <john.mcnelis@cookcountyil.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 03, 2012 12:39 PM
To: Roland Sachs, Jr.
Subject: RE: Items for reference

Roland,

First - We're still compiling all of the recently submitted info from the townships regarding accurate mapping of their roads. We need to review this information, change our maps accordingly, as well as submit to IDOT for their review and approval. I can't say when we'll actually have a new map showing the revised township road system.

Second - I would have to look into the records that Tom Baniewicz kept and try and gather that information together. I know I could give you correct information for the last five or so but I'm not sure yet about digging up the rest of it. I'm looking into it.

Third - Mohammed Quraishi is the one to call regarding this. His number is 312-603-1782. If I recall correctly, he mentioned to me that the $1,200 was from some long past (like in 1987 or something) accounting error that was finally cleared up.

Fourth - We're reviewing the packet submitted. Everything looks good so far. We should be submitting to IDOT soon for approval. I'll keep you updated.

John

Cook County Highway Department
Project Engineer / Township Liaison, Drainage and Utilities Division
69 W. Washington Street, 21st Floor
Chicago, IL 60602
Phone: 312-603-1834

From: Roland Sachs, Jr. [palhwy@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 9:04 AM
To: John McNelis (Highway)
Subject: Items for reference

Dear John,

Good morning. I have a couple questions regarding a couple different issues that I hope you might be able to help me with. They are as follows:

- The first is a revised Township map that shows the correct mileage.
- Second, is a list of the last ten MFT projects.
- Third, any word on the MFT account reconciliation of $1200 posted in August of 2011.
- Finally, I realize I just requested a 2012 MFT Paving Project, but I am curious if you received the email and whether it was complete in order to initiate the project.

There is no rush or deadline, however I just do not want them to fall out of favor and forgotten. Thank you for looking into these matters, I greatly appreciate your consideration.

Regards,
Roland

Roland Sachs, Jr.
Superintendent of Roads
Palatine Township Road District
530 N. Smith Street Palatine, IL 60067
p.: 847.358.6336 f.:847.358.4056
www.palhwy.com