

SCOPE OF SERVICES

DRAFT

Section 23-00999-94-BT

Robert McClory Bike Path Improvements

Russell Road to IL Route 137, Old Elm Road to Vine Avenue
Lake County, Illinois

April 2, 2025

Supplement to PHASE II – DESIGN ENGINEERING SERVICES

Understanding of the Assignment

CBBEL understands that LCDOT would like CBBEL to complete design alternative analysis, related studies, and develop preliminary plans for roadway improvements of four major crossings of Robert McClory Bike Path (RMBP); Belvedere (IDOT), Golf (LCDOT), Washington (Waukegan), Grand (IDOT). These 4 intersections will have ~2600 feet of improved roadway/parkway/sidewalk approaching/crossing RMPB. Coordination with IDOT and Waukegan will be required.

Per original scope (Understanding of Improvements), this work was to be completed by others based off the BLA draft concept and updated based on IDOT/LCDOT/Waukegan reviews. These jurisdictionally approved Preliminary plans (DGN's), specs (Word), and Estimate of Construction Cost (Excel) were to be provided to CBBEL to incorporate into Bid Package 2 (let by LCDOT via permits from IDOT and Waukegan), with minor updates leading to Bid Set submittal.

Tasks

Task 12 – Major Intersections

Concept/Design roadway improvements of four major crossings of Robert McClory Bike Path (RMBP); Belvedere (IDOT), Golf (LCDOT), Washington (Waukegan), Grand (IDOT). These 4 intersections will have ~2600 feet of improved roadway/parkway/sidewalk approaching/crossing RMPB. This will become Bid Package 2, let by LCDOT via permits from IDOT and Waukegan.

Improvements are anticipated to include creating medians with pedestrian refuge islands, RRFB, Overhead RRFB, or HAWK warning devices, curblin/sidewalk/driveway/parkway removal/replacement, power feed connections and potential lighting at crossings. Milling/resurfacing/restriping/signage from crossing to taper ends are also included. Streetscape elements are not anticipated/included.

Task 12.1 - Concept: For each of the intersections update BLA draft concept design's based on comments received from LCDOT for pedestrian refuge islands, showing impacts to abutting properties/driveways/parking/side streets/major street's geometry.

Analysis. Alt A – Concept submittal with RFB. Alt B - Update Concept Submittal crossings to show hybrid/hawk overhead RFB. Alt C – Update Alt B to fit within current curblines. Provide Pro/Con for each Alt. These alternates were requested and presented to LCDOT in a 7/2/24 coordination meeting. Refine selected Alt as per LCDOT request.

Anticipated 80 hours

Task 12.2 - Topographic Survey: CBBEL will perform topographic survey of the roadway corridors (ROW to ROW) encompassing the concept improvement limits for the 4 major intersections [(Belvedere (IDOT), Golf (LCDOT), Washington (Waukegan), Grand (IDOT))] (approximately 2600 feet total flanking both sides of original RMBP corridor survey). Pick-up survey will also be completed at 1 side-path connection. Data will be incorporated into corridor survey, along with requesting/drafting utility information.

Anticipated 194 hours

Task 12.3 – Concept Package: CBBEL will prepare Concept plans and estimate of construction cost based on Task 12.1 and 12.2 and input from Task 12.4. Package will be submitted to LCDOT for distribution to IDOT/Waukegan for coordination as a “Check Set”.

Anticipated 184 hours

Task 12.4 - Coordination: CBBEL will prepare for, attend, create meeting summaries, and follow-up on one LCDOT in-person meeting (4 Staff attended) – 07/02/24 Meeting held, four virtual LCDOT/Municipality meetings (2 Staff anticipated), and 2 virtual IDOT meetings (4 Staff anticipated). CBBEL will also coordinate with Agencies via email, phone etc.

Anticipated 64 hours

Task 12.5 – Traffic Analysis: In our experience, as IDOT coordination has not begun IDOT may likely look for recent/non-COVID bike/ped/vehicle counts that validate TRA-23 analysis.

CBBEL will conduct AM and PM peak hour turning movement classification counts at bike path/road crossing which will include pedestrian and bicyclist data. Additionally, CBBEL will conduct a weekend pedestrian/bicyclist count along the Path and a 24-hour ADT count along the project corridor. These counts will be included with the counts from the 2021

BLA Memorandum, for confirmation of TRA-23 implemented design and for IDOT/Village coordination.

It is anticipated that no IDS will be needed.

CBBEL will provide Traffic Counts (PDF)

Anticipated 24 hours

Task 12.6 – Preliminary / Permit Package: CBBEL will prepare plan set, specifications, and estimate of construction cost based on Task 12.1 -Task 12.6. A disposition to comments received to date will also be provided. Package will be submitted concurrently to LCDOT/IDOT/Waukegan for review. CBBEL will submit to Utilities.

| Sheet Type | No Sheets | Hour/Sheet | Total Hours |
|--|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| General Notes (additional) | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Summary of Quantities | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Schedules | 2 | 6 | 12 |
| Typicals | 4 | 10 | 40 |
| Alignment, Ties, Benchmark | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| Existing Conditions/Removal Plan | 10 | 4 | 40 |
| Proposed Plan | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| Pavement Marking/Signage Plan | 10 | 2 | 20 |
| Utility Adjustment and Grading Plan | 10 | 8 | 80 |
| ADA Grading Details | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| Construction Details | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| | 66 | | 430 |
| | | | |
| Special Provisions | | | 12 |
| Quantities/Estimated Construction Cost | | | 16 |
| IDOT Permit Submittal | | | 26 |
| QAQC | | | 9 |
| | | | |
| Total | | | 493 |

It is anticipated that curblineline modifications will not require drainage upgrades/analysis, and lighting will not require photometric analysis.

These designs and comments will be incorporated into the Original Scope Task 8 work.

Anticipated 493 hours

Task 13 – Soil Investigation

Task 13.1 Environmental Analysis Testing Service Corporation (TSC) will analyze collected geotechnical soil borings and provide an Environmental Analysis Report regarding potentially non-CCDD areas within the corridor.

CBBEL will include the report in the bid documents and annotate plans to show potential non-CCDD areas. Spoil in these areas to remain on-site, with other spoils being available for haul-off.

CBBEL anticipated 8 hours. TSC Direct Cost \$4291.

Task 13.2 LP-663 TSC will provide LP-663 and request pre-approval letters from Thelan for Bid Package 1 (Path paving and culvert upgrades).

CBBEL anticipated 0 hours. TSC Direct Cost \$5,500 (proposal attached).

Task 13.3 LP-663 TSC will provide LP-663 and request pre-approval letters from Thelan for Bid Package 2 (Major intersections).

CBBEL anticipated 0 hours. TSC Direct Cost \$11,050 (proposal attached).

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Local Public Agency Lake County Division of Transportation | County Lake | Section Number 23-00999-94-BT |
| Prime Consultant (Firm) Name Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. | Prepared By Bryan Luke | Date 3/19/2025 |
| Consultant / Subconsultant Name Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. | Job Number Robert McClory Bike Path | |

Note: This is name of the consultant the CECS is being completed for. This name appears at the top of each tab.

Remarks

PAYROLL ESCALATION TABLE

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|
| CONTRACT TERM | 20 | MONTHS | OVERHEAD RATE | 131.31% |
| START DATE | 4/1/2025 | | COMPLEXITY FACTOR | |
| RAISE DATE | 1/1/2026 | | % OF RAISE | 2.00% |
| END DATE | 11/30/2026 | | | |

ESCALATION PER YEAR

| Year | First Date | Last Date | Months | % of Contract |
|------|------------|-----------|--------|---------------|
| 0 | 4/1/2025 | 1/1/2026 | 9 | 45.00% |
| 1 | 1/2/2026 | 12/1/2026 | 11 | 56.10% |

The total escalation = 1.10%

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| Local Public Agency | County | Section Number |
| Lake County Division of Transportation | Lake | 23-00999-94-BT |
| Consultant / Subconsultant Name | Job Number | |
| Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. | Robert McClory Bike Path | |

PAYROLL RATES

EXHIBIT D COST ESTIMATE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES (CECS) WORKSHEET FIXED RAISE

| | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| MAXIMUM PAYROLL RATE | 86.00 |
| ESCALATION FACTOR | 1.10% |

| CLASSIFICATION | IDOT PAYROLL RATES ON FILE | CALCULATED RATE |
|--|---|------------------------|
| Engineer VI | \$83.06 | \$83.97 |
| Engineer V | \$72.37 | \$73.17 |
| Engineer IV | \$59.40 | \$60.05 |
| Engineer III | \$45.29 | \$45.79 |
| Engineer I/II | \$37.53 | \$37.94 |
| Survey V | \$86.00 | \$86.00 |
| Survey IV | \$79.30 | \$80.17 |
| Survey III | \$68.82 | \$69.58 |
| Survey II | \$56.50 | \$57.12 |
| Survey I | \$40.63 | \$41.08 |
| Engineering Technician V | \$71.00 | \$71.78 |
| Engineering Technician IV | \$55.23 | \$55.84 |
| Engineering Technician III | \$46.30 | \$46.81 |
| Engineering Technician I/II | \$34.50 | \$34.88 |
| CAD Manager | \$73.26 | \$74.07 |
| CAD Technician II | \$54.39 | \$54.99 |
| GIS Specialist III | \$61.00 | \$61.67 |
| Landscape Architect | \$69.00 | \$69.76 |
| Landscape Designer I/II | \$31.50 | \$31.85 |
| Environmental Resource Specialist V | \$75.93 | \$76.77 |
| Environmental Resource Specialist IV | \$63.80 | \$64.50 |
| Environmental Resource Specialist III | \$42.33 | \$42.80 |
| Environmental Resource Specialist I/II | \$31.67 | \$32.02 |
| Environmental Resource Technician | \$46.80 | \$47.31 |
| Engineering Intern | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Lake County Division of Transportation

Lake

23-00999-94-BT

Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.

Robert McClory Bike Path

COST ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

EXHIBIT D COST ESTIMATE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES (CECS) WORKSHEET

OVERHEAD RATE 131.31%

COMPLEXITY FACTOR 0

[illegible]

121,814

Local Public Agency

Lake County Division of Transportation

Consultant / Subconsultant Name

Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.

County

Lake

Section Number

23-00999-94-BT

Job Number

AVERAGE HOURLY PROJECT RATES

EXHIBIT D COST ESTIMATE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES (CECS) WORKSHEET

SHEET 3 OF 3

| PAYROLL CLASSIFICATION | AVG HOURLY RATES | Taks 12 - COF-01-1 4 Major Intersection | | | Taks 13 - COF-01-2 Soils Investigation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|--|------------|-------------|---|------------|-------------|-------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|-------------|-------|------------|-------------|
| | | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg | Hours | % Part. | Wgtd Avg |
| Engineer VI | 83.97 | 16 | 1.54% | 1.29 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineer V | 73.17 | 120 | 11.55% | 8.45 | 2 | 25.00% | 18.29 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineer IV | 60.05 | 54 | 5.20% | 3.12 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineer III | 45.79 | 395 | 38.02% | 17.41 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineer I/II | 37.94 | 260 | 25.02% | 9.49 | 6 | 75.00% | 28.46 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey V | 86.00 | 6 | 0.58% | 0.50 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey IV | 80.17 | 16 | 1.54% | 1.23 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey III | 69.58 | 24 | 2.31% | 1.61 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey II | 57.12 | 54 | 5.20% | 2.97 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey I | 41.08 | 54 | 5.20% | 2.13 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering Technician V | 71.78 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering Technician IV | 55.84 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering Technician III | 46.81 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering Technician I/II | 34.88 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAD Manager | 74.07 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAD Technician II | 54.99 | 40 | 3.85% | 2.12 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| GIS Specialist III | 61.67 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Landscape Architect | 69.76 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Landscape Designer I/II | 31.85 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Resource Spe | 76.77 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Resource Spe | 64.50 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Resource Spe | 42.80 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Resource Spe | 32.02 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Resource Tec | 47.31 | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering Itern | | 0 | | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTALS | | 1039.0 | 100% | \$50.33 | 8.0 | 100% | \$46.75 | 0.0 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0.0 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0.0 | 0% | \$0.00 | 0.0 | 0% | \$0.00 |



TESTING SERVICE CORPORATION

Corporate Office

360 South Main Place, Carol Stream, IL 60188-2404
Phone 630.462.2600

March 12, 2025

Mr. Bryan Luke
Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
9575 West Higgins Road, Suite 600
Rosemont, IL 60018-4920

RE: P.N. 75,020
Environmental Analysis for LPC-662/663 Form
Robert McClory Bike Path
Russell Road to 24th Street
Lake County, IL

Dear Mr. Luke:

Testing Service Corporation (TSC) is pleased to submit this proposal to perform a “Potentially Impacted Property” (PIP) evaluation, sampling and laboratory analyses for completion of the LPC-662 Form and, if necessary, provide sampling and laboratory analyses for completion of the LPC-663 Form at the above captioned project. The proposal was prepared in response to your email and phone request dated March 11, 2025. TSC previously performed an environmental analysis summary under its job number L – 97,063 dated August 9, 2024, for the disposal of construction spoils at the Reliable/Bluff City CCDD facility utilizing specific parameters provided by that facility on February 2, 2024. The particular boring locations tested were also chosen based on distance requirements provided by Reliable/Bluff City and targeted commercial areas along the path.

Uncontaminated soil including uncontaminated soil mixed with clean construction or demolition debris (CCDD) accepted at a CCDD fill operation must be certified to be uncontaminated soil in accordance with Section 22.51(f)(2)(B) of the Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/22.51(f)(2)(B)]. Uncontaminated soil accepted at an uncontaminated soil fill operation (USFO) must be certified to be uncontaminated soil in accordance with Section 22.51a(d)(2)(B) of the Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/22.51a(d)(2)(B)]. These certifications must be made by a licensed professional engineer or geologist (PE/PG) using the LPC-663 Form when the soil is removed from a source site which is determined by the PE/PG to be a “Potentially Impacted Property” (PIP) based on review of readily ascertainable property history, environmental databases and site reconnaissance. Uncontaminated soil from a source site which is not identified as a PIP by the PE/PG may be certified by either the source site owner or operator using LPC-662 with pH analysis only.

Project Description:

Our understanding of the existing site conditions and the proposed construction project are as follows:

- The source site (“Site”) is a portion of the Robert McClory bike path in a mixed-use area of Lake County, IL. The bike path Site portion runs for 15.8 miles between Russell Road and 24th Street. The activity that is generating the soil for disposal is reconstruction of the bike path with various new materials, associated curb improvements and concrete repairs and construction, culvert replacement, and ditch improvements, etc.

Records Review:

In conducting the PIP evaluation, TSC will evaluate current Federal and State environmental agency records for the source site and vicinity by obtaining a First Report from Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). Review of the EDR First Report assists in identifying potential contamination sources, both at the source site and from adjoining properties which may cause the source site to be considered a PIP. Historical aerial photographs and topographic maps will be reviewed to identify the approximate development date and current and previous usage of the source site and adjoining properties. TSC will also perform a site reconnaissance to evaluate the property for evidence of the use or release of hazardous substances or petroleum products and to collect soil for analysis of pH.

Based on the results of this review, the TSC Professional Geologist will conclude if the source site is a PIP. If the source site is not identified as a PIP and pH analysis meet requirements, TSC will prepare a letter discussing the reviewed information and conclusion that the source site is not a PIP and recommend that the Owner or Operator sign the prepared LPC-662 Form certifying that the site is not a PIP and the soil is presumed to be uncontaminated. The LPC-662 Form is acceptable at most CCDD/USFO facilities.

LPC-663 Analytical Testing (if required)

In the event that the source site (or portions thereof) is identified as a PIP, the owner/operator is unwilling to sign the LPC-662 Form or the prospective USFO facility selected for disposal of the soil requires analysis for acceptance of the soil, TSC will prepare the LPC-663 form for offsite disposal of Site soil. Shallow soil samples were collected by direct push methodology from zones to be excavated as part of the proposed site improvements. The soil samples were screened with a photo-ionization detector (PID) used to check for the presence of volatile organic vapors. Selected samples were placed in laboratory supplied jars and vials using Method 5035 and properly preserved in a cooler on ice. They will be shipped to an analytical laboratory following standard chain-of-custody procedures.

The number of samples analyzed and the parameters of the analytical testing were based upon the testing needs proposed by Reliable/Bluff City. Five areas deemed commercial had samples analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX); polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PNAs); total RCRA Metals and pH. All other samples were tested for pH only.

The list of analytical parameters noted is acceptable at the majority of local CCDD/USFO facilities although analysis of additional parameters may be required by some USFO facilities. If possible, we recommend that the CCDD/USFO facility destination to be used for a particular project be contacted to verify that the analytical parameters proposed will be sufficient. In particular, Elmhurst Chicago Stone (ECS) requires analysis of additional parameters of the full MAC list, listed as an optional item in Cost Estimate.

The analytical results were compared to Maximum Allowable Concentrations of Chemical Constituents in Uncontaminated Soil Used as Fill Material at Regulated Fill Operations (MACs) as presented in 35 IAC 1100.Subpart F.

One sample tested for total RCRA metals exhibited a concentration of chromium that exceeded the respective MAC, therefore, additional analysis of SPLP extract was performed for that metal on that

sample. In accordance with 35IAC1100.610(b)(3)(C), as an alternative to the MAC value, compliance verification may be determined by comparing soil sample extraction results by TCLP or SPLP to the respective TACO Class 1 Soil Component of the Groundwater Ingestion Exposure Route Objective in 35IAC742 Appendix B, Table A.

A summary report will be prepared which describes the sampling procedures and results of the analytical laboratory testing. If all analytical results meet their respective MACs, Form LPC-663 will be filled out and signed by a Licensed Professional Geologist. The LPC-663 Form will be included as an attachment to the report.

Please note that our signing of the LPC-663 Form is contingent upon all constituents meeting their respective MACs. If any constituent exceeds the MACs, the Licensed Professional Geologist will not be able to certify the soil as uncontaminated or may exclude areas from the LPC-663 Form.

If the analytical results exceed the MACs or TACO Objective which prevent certification of the soil as uncontaminated, additional analysis may be required in connection with disposal of the soil at a Subtitle D landfill. There will likely be an additional charge for associated consulting, analytical testing and completion of the waste profile.

Fees and Turnaround Time:

The estimated costs of the outlined scope of services are presented on the Cost Estimate attached. Completion of the PIP Evaluation, sampling and analysis for the completion of the LPC-662 or LPC-663 Form can be expected in approximately two (2) weeks following authorization to proceed at standard laboratory turnaround time of 5-7 business days, or three (3) weeks if follow-up TCLP/SPLP metals analysis is required. If expedited turnaround is needed, 2-3 business day turnaround can be obtained from the laboratory at a surcharge of 100%. Please notify TSC to authorize this additional charge.

Closure:

The environmental services being performed are subject to TSC's attached General Conditions. Unless we receive written instructions to the contrary, invoices will be sent to:

Mr. Bryan Luke
Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
9575 West Higgins Road Suite 600
Rosemont, IL 60018-4920
Tel: (847)-823-0500
Email: bluke@cbbel.com

If this proposal meets with your approval, please indicate your acceptance by signing one copy and returning it to our Carol Stream, Illinois office. It would be helpful if you could also complete the attached Project Data form indicating who is to receive copies of TSC's report and other related information.

Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
Robert McClory Bike Path
Proposal 75,020 - March 12, 2025

Your consideration of our proposal is appreciated. We look forward to being of service to you on this project.

Respectfully submitted,

TESTING SERVICE CORPORATION



Aaron Ulrey, P.G.
Senior Geologist

Enc: Cost Estimate
General Conditions
Project Data Sheet

Approved and accepted for _____ by:

(NAME)

(TITLE)

(DATE)

COST ESTIMATE
PIP EVALUATION FOR LPC-662 AND LPC-663 ANALYSIS

| ITEM | | UNITS | QTY | RATE | COST |
|--|--|----------|-----|----------|-------------|
| STEP 1: RECORDS REVIEW, SITE RECONNAISSANCE & PH ANALYSIS FOR PIP EVALUATION | | | | | |
| 1.1 | PIP Evaluation, Completion of LPC-662 Form for Owner's Signature if Site is not Identified as a PIP | Lump Sum | 5 | 600.00 | \$ 3,000.00 |
| REPORTING SERVICES | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Professional Geologist for Project Management and Prepare Summary Report, with P.G. Signed Form LPC-663, if uncontaminated | Lump Sum | 5 | 500.00 | \$ 2,500.00 |
| 2.2 | Additional Analytical Testing and Completion of Waste Profile if Soil is Landfilled | Est. | 0 | 2,000.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| COST OF PIP EVALUATION AND LPC-662 FORM | | | | | \$ 3,000.00 |
| ADDITIONAL ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES FOR COMPLETION OF LPC-663 SERVICES IF PIP IS IDENTIFIED (STANDARD TAT): | | | | | \$ 2,500.00 |
| ESTIMATED TOTAL COST FOR PIP EVALUATION & LPC-663 SERVICES (STANDARD TAT): | | | | | \$ 5,500.00 |

- Does not include additional analysis for disposal at ECS facilities.



TESTING SERVICE CORPORATION

Corporate Office

360 South Main Place, Carol Stream, IL 60188-2404
Phone 630.462.2600

April 1, 2025

Mr. Bryan Luke
Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
9575 West Higgins Road Suite 600
Rosemont, IL 60018-4920

RE: P.N. 75,185
Environmental Analysis for LPC-662/663 Form
Robert McClory Bike Path
Four Intersections – Belvidere Road, Washington Street, Grand Avenue, Golf Road
Lake County, IL

Dear Mr. Luke:

Testing Service Corporation (TSC) is pleased to submit this proposal to perform a “Potentially Impacted Property” (PIP) evaluation, sampling and laboratory analyses for completion of the LPC-662 Form and, if necessary, provide sampling and laboratory analyses for completion of the LPC-663 Form at the above captioned project. The proposal was prepared in response to your email and phone request dated March 1, 2025.

Uncontaminated soil including uncontaminated soil mixed with clean construction or demolition debris (CCDD) accepted at a CCDD fill operation must be certified to be uncontaminated soil in accordance with Section 22.51(f)(2)(B) of the Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/22.51(f)(2)(B)]. Uncontaminated soil accepted at an uncontaminated soil fill operation (USFO) must be certified to be uncontaminated soil in accordance with Section 22.51a(d)(2)(B) of the Environmental Protection Act [415 ILCS 5/22.51a(d)(2)(B)]. These certifications must be made by a licensed professional engineer or geologist (PE/PG) using the LPC-663 Form when the soil is removed from a source site which is determined by the PE/PG to be a “Potentially Impacted Property” (PIP) based on review of readily ascertainable property history, environmental databases and site reconnaissance. Uncontaminated soil from a source site which is not identified as a PIP by the PE/PG may be certified by either the source site owner or operator using LPC-662 with pH analysis only.

Project Description:

Our understanding of the existing site conditions and the proposed construction project are as follows:

- The source sites are street intersections along the proposed Robert McClory Bike Path. Construction of the infrastructure for the bike path in these locations will generate excess spoils for disposal offsite.

Records Review:

In conducting the PIP evaluation, TSC will evaluate current Federal and State environmental agency records for the source site and vicinity by obtaining a First Report from Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR). Review of the EDR First Report assists in identifying potential contamination sources, both at the source site and from adjoining properties which may cause the source site to be considered a PIP. Historical aerial photographs and topographic maps will be reviewed to identify the approximate development date and current and previous usage of the source site and adjoining properties. TSC will

also perform a site reconnaissance to evaluate the property for evidence of the use or release of hazardous substances or petroleum products and to collect soil for analysis of pH.

Based on the results of this review, the TSC Professional Geologist will conclude if the source site is a PIP. If the source site is not identified as a PIP and pH analysis meet requirements, TSC will prepare a letter discussing the reviewed information and conclusion that the source site is not a PIP and recommend that the Owner or Operator sign the prepared LPC-662 Form certifying that the site is not a PIP and the soil is presumed to be uncontaminated. The LPC-662 Form is acceptable at most CCDD/USFO facilities.

Based on the current usage of the site, it is expected that the site may not be identified as a PIP and that an LPC-662 form may be utilized. Initial review indicates the overall commercial area of the site will likely cause it to be identified as a PIP and that an LPC-663 form will be utilized.

LPC-663 Analytical Testing (if required)

In the event that the source site (or portions thereof) is identified as a PIP, the owner/operator is unwilling to sign the LPC-662 Form or the prospective USFO facility selected for disposal of the soil requires analysis for acceptance of the soil, TSC will perform additional soil analysis for completion of the LPC-663 form at additional costs outlined in this proposal. Shallow soil samples are to be collected by hand auger/shovel methods from zones to be excavated as part of the proposed site improvements. The soil samples will be screened with a photo-ionization detector (PID) used to check for the presence of volatile organic vapors. Selected samples will be placed in laboratory supplied jars and vials using Method 5035 and properly preserved in a cooler on ice. They will be shipped to an analytical laboratory following standard chain-of-custody procedures.

The number of samples analyzed and the parameters of the analytical testing were based upon the testing needs proposed by Reliable/Bluff City. Five areas deemed commercial had samples analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX); polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PNAs); total RCRA Metals and pH. All other samples were tested for pH only.

The list of analytical parameters noted is acceptable at the majority of local CCDD/USFO facilities although analysis of additional parameters may be required by some USFO facilities. If possible, we recommend that the CCDD/USFO facility destination to be used for a particular project be contacted to verify that the analytical parameters proposed will be sufficient. In particular, Elmhurst Chicago Stone (ECS) requires analysis of additional parameters of the full MAC list, listed as an optional item in Cost Estimate.

The analytical results will be compared to Maximum Allowable Concentrations of Chemical Constituents in Uncontaminated Soil Used as Fill Material at Regulated Fill Operations (MACs) as presented in 35 IAC 1100.Subpart F.

It should be noted that if one or more total metals concentrations exceed their respective MAC, additional analysis of the TCLP or SPLP extract may be performed for those metals. In accordance with 35IAC1100.610(b)(3)(C), as an alternative to the MAC value, compliance verification may be determined by comparing soil sample extraction results by TCLP or SPLP to the respective TACO Class 1 Soil Component of the Groundwater Ingestion Exposure Route Objective in 35IAC742 Appendix B, Table A. TSC will perform this additional analysis if all other parameters with the

exception of the metal(s) meet the MACs and has included an allowance for two samples in the Cost Estimate.

A summary report will be prepared which describes the sampling procedures and results of the analytical laboratory testing. If all analytical results meet their respective MACs, Form LPC-663 will be filled out and signed by a Licensed Professional Geologist. The LPC-663 Form will be included as an attachment to the report. TSC will also perform a search of local CCDDs to the Sites in order to acquire pre-authorization to dispose at those facilities once the PIPs are completed, per the client's request.

Please note that our signing of the LPC-663 Form is contingent upon all constituents meeting their respective MACs. If any constituent exceeds the MACs, the Licensed Professional Geologist will not be able to certify the soil as uncontaminated or may exclude areas from the LPC-663 Form.

If the analytical results exceed the MACs or TACO Objective which prevent certification of the soil as uncontaminated, additional analysis may be required in connection with disposal of the soil at a Subtitle D landfill. There will likely be an additional charge for associated consulting, analytical testing and completion of the waste profile.

Fees and Turnaround Time:

The estimated costs of the outlined scope of services are presented on the Cost Estimate attached. Completion of the PIP Evaluation, sampling and analysis for the completion of the LPC-662 or LPC-663 Form can be expected in approximately three (3) weeks following authorization to proceed at standard laboratory turnaround time of 5-7 business days, or four (4) weeks if follow-up TCLP/SPLP metals analysis is required. If expedited turnaround is needed, 2-3 business day turnaround can be obtained from the laboratory at a surcharge of 100%. Please notify TSC to authorize this additional charge.

Closure:

The environmental services being performed are subject to TSC's attached General Conditions. Unless we receive written instructions to the contrary, invoices will be sent to:

Mr. Bryan Luke
Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd.
9575 West Higgins Road Suite 600
Rosemont, IL 60018-4920
Tel: (847)-823-0500
Email: bluke@cbbel.com

If this proposal meets with your approval, please indicate your acceptance by signing one copy and returning it to our Carol Stream, Illinois office. It would be helpful if you could also complete the attached Project Data form indicating who is to receive copies of TSC's report and other related information.

Your consideration of our proposal is appreciated. We look forward to being of service to you on this project.

Respectfully submitted,

TESTING SERVICE CORPORATION



Aaron Ulrey, P.G.
Senior Geologist

Enc: Cost Estimate
General Conditions
Project Data Sheet

Approved and accepted for _____ by:

(NAME)

(TITLE)

(DATE)

COST ESTIMATE
PIP EVALUATION FOR LPC-662 AND LPC-663 ANALYSIS

| ITEM | | UNITS | QTY | RATE | COST |
|--|---|----------|-----|----------|--------------|
| STEP 1: RECORDS REVIEW, SITE RECONNAISSANCE & PH ANALYSIS FOR PIP EVALUATION | | | | | |
| 1.1 | PIP Evaluation, Layout and JULIE Sample Locations, Collect Hand Auger Samples for Analysis, Completion of LPC-662 Form for Owner's Signature if Site is not Identified as a PIP, CCDD Pre-Authorization | Lump Sum | 4 | 1,750.00 | \$ 7,000.00 |
| 1.2 | PID Screening | Lump Sum | 1 | 150.00 | \$ 150.00 |
| STEP 2: IF A PIP IS IDENTIFIED, BELOW ARE ADDITIONAL COSTS FOR LPC-663 ANALYSIS | | | | | |
| ANALYTICAL TESTING FOR LPC-663 FORM | | | | | |
| 2.1 | BTEX, PNAs, RCRA Metals & pH @ Standard 5 to 7 Business Day Turnaround (Analysis Dependent on Contaminants of Concern Identified in PIP Evaluation) | Each | 4 | 400.00 | \$ 1,600.00 |
| 2.2 | Surcharge for Expedited 2-3 Business Day Turnaround | Each | 0 | 100% | \$ 0.00 |
| 2.3 | TCLP/SPLP Analysis of Metals which exceed MACs, if required (Cost dependent on specific metals analyzed) | Each | 2 | 150.00 | \$ 300.00 |
| 2.4 | Analytical testing for full MAC list, required at some CCDD/USFO facilities @ Standard 5 to 7 Business Day Turnaround | Each | 0 | 1,750.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| REPORTING SERVICES | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Professional Geologist for Project Management and Prepare Summary Report, with P.G. Signed Form LPC-663, if uncontaminated | Lump Sum | 4 | 500.00 | \$ 2,000.00 |
| 3.2 | Additional Analytical Testing and Completion of Waste Profile if Soil is Landfilled | Est. | 0 | 2,000.00 | \$ 0.00 |
| COST OF PIP EVALUATION AND LPC-662 FORM | | | | | \$ 7,150.00 |
| ADDITIONAL ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICES FOR COMPLETION OF LPC-663 SERVICES IF PIP IS IDENTIFIED (STANDARD TAT): | | | | | \$ 3,900.00 |
| ESTIMATED TOTAL COST FOR PIP EVALUATION & LPC-663 SERVICES (STANDARD TAT): | | | | | \$ 11,050.00 |

- Does not include additional analysis for disposal at ECS facilities.