WAR DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS
WASHINGTON

October 10, 1919.

From: The Chief of Engineers.

To: The District Engineer, Chicago, Ill.

Subject: Data for consideration of permits for filling under the Chicago Lake Front Ordinance.

1. In order that the fullest data may be available for the consideration of permits for filling under the Chicago Lake Front Ordinance, you are requested to supplement the comprehensive presentation of the subject contained in your report of the 17th ultimo, by information on the following points:

(a) For what intended purpose is the extra trackage to be afforded the Illinois Central Railroad Company by the land to be granted them? Is it necessary for terminal operation or is it for car storage incident to such operation, which might be located elsewhere?

(b) How does the present trackage and the added amount compare with the trackage in use in the Pennsylvania and Grand Central Station in New York and their immediate approaches?

(c) How do the number of trains using the tracks and the number of passengers carried compare at the three places?

(d) Since each increase of the width of fill pushes the outer fill boundary and works required beyond into deeper water why is the increased cost of these outer necessary works not borne by the Illinois Central Railroad?

(e) In view of the decision given by Mr. Justice Field in the Lake Front Case (146 U.S.387) is the grant of this land to the railroad company lawful, and if lawful, is it to be considered consistent with public policy?

(f) What is the increase in cost per quarter mile from the river entrance, of transportation per ton caused by the use of the Chicago River for lake traffic? What is the total increase of cost due to this use of Chicago River?

(g) Why is the existing city pier not used intensively?

(h) What is the cost and time of transfer for freight and for passengers from the present city pier to the heart of the retail district, of the wholesale district, and of the hotel district?
From: The Office of Air Lines

To: The Office of Air Lines

Subject: OSHA's New Right to Know Rules

In order for OSHA to enforce the new Right to Know rules that took effect May 1, 1975, companies must provide employees with information on the hazards associated with their job and the chemicals they use. OSHA has developed a set of standards and guidelines to help companies comply with these rules. The following points summarize OSHA's new Right to Know rules:

1. Each employee has a right to know the hazards associated with their job.
2. Each employer must make available to employees a list of hazardous chemicals and their hazardous properties.
3. Each employer must provide employees with information on the hazards associated with each chemical.
4. Each employer must train employees in the safe handling and use of hazardous chemicals.
5. Each employer must maintain an emergency response plan for hazardous spills and releases.

These rules apply to all employers and employees in the United States, regardless of their industry or size. OSHA has developed a series of training materials to help employers and employees understand and comply with these rules. These materials are available on the OSHA website and through local OSHA offices. Employers and employees are encouraged to review these materials and take the necessary steps to comply with OSHA's new Right to Know rules.
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(i) If Grant Park were released for commercial purposes, and the terminal frontage developed, what would the cost and time of transfer of freight and for passengers from these terminals to the above mentioned points be?

(j) What is roughly the area adjacent to the Chicago River used for warehouses and similar used connected with the present river traffic?

(k) Is there any difference between wholesale and retail price of coal and similar bulk commodities in Milwaukee and in Chicago, due to the difference in harbor facilities at the two points?

(l) Is there any likelihood that the area designated as Harbor District No. 3 would have any more commercial development than the present Harbor District No. 2; if District No. 3, as proposed, abutted on a park?

(m) What would be the approximate cost per square foot of filling land for warehouses, etc., in the area of Harbor District No. 3?

(n) What would be roughly the difference in cost of a breakwater to protect District No. 3 as proposed and a breakwater to protect the same area withdrawn landward by the aggregate width of the proposed grant to the Illinois Central Railroad and the park area?

By command of the Chief of Engineers.

G.B. Pillsbury
Colonel of Engineers