PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL RESTORATION PLAN BUTTE AREA ONE



Prepared for:

Montana Department of Justice

1301 East Lockey Helena, MT 59620

February 2, 2015

Prepared by:



PO Box 1133 Bozeman, MT 59771-1133

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Intro	duction1
1.1	. Ba	ackground and Purpose1
1.2	. Ro	ble of the BNRC and Public2
1.3	. Βι	utte Area One Overview4
1.4	. Co	onceptual Restoration Plan Objectives6
1.5	. PF	RCP Content and Scope6
1.6	. As	sumptions7
1.7	. Sı	Immary of Changes to Draft PCRP7
2.	Parr	ot Tailings PROJECT9
2.1	. Ta	ilings/Contaminated Materials Removal9
2	2.1.1.	Removal Activities
	2.1.2.	Estimated Removal costs
2.2	. Re	esultant Restoration and End Land Use20
	2.2.1. 2.2.2.	End Land Use Considerations
3.	Digg	ings East and Northside Tailings PROJECT26
3.1	. Ta	ilings/Contaminated Materials Removal26
3	3.1.1.	Removal Actions
	3.1.2. 3.1.3.	Estimated Removal costs
3.2	. Re	esultant Restoration and End Land Use
	3.2.1.	Alternative 1 End Land Use Considerations
	3.2.2. 3.2.3.	Resultant Restoration and End Land Use Costs
4.	Blac	ktail Berm Project48
лл	Ta	ilings/Contaminated Materials Removal
4.1	. 18 144	Demoval Actions
2	+.1.1. 1.1.2.	Transport and Disposal Options
2	1.1.3.	Estimated Removal Costs
4.2	. Re	esultant Restoration and End Land Uses52

	4.2.1. 4.2.2. 4.2.3. 4.2.4.	Alternative 1 End Land Use Considerations Alternative 2 End Land Use Considerations Alternative 3 End Land Use Considerations Resultant Restoration and End Land Use Costs	.52 .53 .53 .59
5.	COS	TESTIMATES OF pcrp ALTERNATIVES	.62
6.	SUM	MARY of Data and Analysis needs	.63
	6.1.1.	BAO Sitewide	.63
	6.1.2.	Parrot Tailings	.63
	6.1.3.	Diggings East and Northside Tailings	.64
	6.1.4.	Blacktail Berm	.64
7.	Refe	rences	.65

Cover: Tailings at Parrot operation, ca 1906. From *Hugh Magone v. Colorado Smelting and Refining Co., et.al* records. Magone sued for damages because the piles of tailings from the ore concentrator and smelter operated by Anaconda polluted the waters of the Deer Lodge River and his farm in Deer Lodge Valley. Citing the economic benefit of the mines and smelters to the region, the Master of the Chancery said the plaintiff ought to have known the water was polluted and refused to award monetary damages.

TABLES

Table 1	Parrot Tailings Removal Costs	20
Table 2	Parrot Tailings Restoration Costs	25
Table 3	Diggings East and Northside Tailings, Estimated Removal Costs	36
Table 4	Diggings East Restoration Cost, Alternative 1	44
Table 5	Northside Tailings Restoration Cost, Alternative 1	45
Table 6	Diggings East Restoration Cost, Alternative 2	46
Table 7	Northside Tailings Restoration Cost, Alternative 2	47
Table 8	Blacktail Berm Removal Cost, Scenario A	51
Table 9	Blacktail Berm Removal Cost, Scenario B	52
Table 10	Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 1	59
Table 11	Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 2	60
Table 12	Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 3	61
Table 13	Summary Cost Estimates of PCRP Alternatives	62

FIGURES

Figure 1	Butte Area One Overview.	5
Figure 2	Borehole locations, Parrot Tailings Project Area	.13
Figure 3	Parrot Tailings Project Area Existing Conditions	.15
Figure 4	Parrot Tailings Project Area Cross Sections, Section A	.16
Figure 5	Parrot Tailings Project Area Cross Sections, Section B	.17
Figure 6	Parrot Tailings Project Area Property Ownership	.18
Figure 7	Parrot Tailings Project Area – Borehole log Based Estimate of Groundwater Saturated Contaminated Materials within the Expected Excavation Area	.19
Figure 8	Parrot Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative	.23
Figure 9	Parrot Tailings Project Area, PCRP Restoration Cross section at 1:1	.24
Figure 10	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Borehole Locations	.28
Figure 11	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Existing Conditions	.30
Figure 12	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section A	.31
Figure 13	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section B	.32
Figure 14	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section C	.33
Figure 15	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Property Ownership.	.34
Figure 16	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative 1	. 38
Figure 17	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative 2	.40
Figure 18	Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Typical Cross Section Riparian/Wetland Swale	.43
Figure 19	Blacktail Berm Project Area, Borehole Locations	.49
Figure 20	Blacktail Berm Project Area, Property Ownership	.50
Figure 21	Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 1	.54
Figure 22	Blacktail Berm Restoration Conceptual Cross Sections, Alternatives 1 and 2.	.55

Figure 23	Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 2	56
Figure 24	Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 3	57
Figure 25	Blacktail Berm Restoration Conceptual Cross Sections, Alternative 3	58

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Purpose

In 1983, the State of Montana filed a lawsuit in federal District Court against the Atlantic Richfield Co. (ARCO) for injuries to the natural resources in the Upper Clark Fork River Basin (UCFRB), which extends from Butte to Milltown. The *Montana v. ARCO* lawsuit, brought under federal and state Superfund laws, sought damages from ARCO, contending that decades of mining and smelting in the Butte and Anaconda areas had greatly harmed natural resources in the basin and deprived Montanans of their use.

The State settled *Montana v. ARCO* through a series of settlement agreements, or consent decrees, completed and approved by the Court in 1999, 2005 and 2008. One of the three injured areas in the UCFRB covered under the 2008 settlement agreement was the Butte Area One injured groundwater and surface water site.

The 2008 *Montana v. ARCO* Consent Decree allocated \$28.1 million, plus interest, to restore, replace or acquire the equivalent of the injured groundwater and surface water of Butte Area One (BAO). Governor Schweitzer created the Butte Natural Resource Damage Restoration Council (BNRC) to give the citizens of Butte a strong voice on how this fund should be spent. The nine member volunteer council, with assistance from the Montana Natural Resource Damage Program (NRDP), developed the 2012 Butte Area One Final Restoration Plan (2012 BAO Plan) to guide the expenditure of these funds. The 2012 BAO Plan built on the 2007 Butte Area One Draft Conceptual Restoration Plan, attached to the 2008 *Montana v. ARCO* Consent Decree.

A major component of the 2012 BAO Plan is the restoration of the historic Upper Silver Bow Creek Corridor.¹ The 2012 BAO Plan calls for removal of mine wastes

¹ The 2012 BAO Plan stated:

At this time a Consent Decree finalizing the remedial actions for Butte Priority Solis Operable Unit has not been reached, however, in keeping with their goal, the BNRC has produced this restoration plan in time for the Governor's consideration. Since the final Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit remedy plan is unknown, this restoration plan is not as specific as the council had desired. Instead, it offers enough flexibility that it should complement the future remedy and not take its place.

The State's goal is successful negotiation of a Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit (BPSOU) consent decree. Nevertheless, should BPSOU consent decree negotiations fail, NRDP would then discuss options with the BNRC as well as the public, consistent with Section 6 of the 2012 BAO Plan, regarding expenditures of the historic Upper Silver Bow Creek corridor funding. Such discussions would focus on those actions which complement, rather than replace, future remedy actions deemed necessary by the State

left in place along the historic floodplain of Silver Bow Creek through BAO. The 2012 BAO Plan identifies these wastes, which include the Parrot Tailings, Diggings East, Northside Tailings and other isolated areas of mine wastes in the Blacktail and Upper Silver Bow Creek floodplains, as the primary sources supplying inorganic contaminants to the alluvial groundwater and surface water resources within the historic Silver Bow Creek corridor. The 2012 BAO Plan noted that leaving these wastes in place was by far the greatest concern expressed by the majority of the citizens that responded during the public solicitation process. The 2012 BAO Plan also noted:

The restoration of the Upper Silver Bow Creek corridor, as provided above, will become part of a more definitive restoration plan that will be developed by the NRDP before the ongoing BPSOU [Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit] Consent Decree negotiations are concluded. That plan will be funded with up to a \$10 million allocation provided for in this section and, it is envisioned, from other funding sources. The more definitive plan, whether or not other sources are found to contribute to its funding, shall be treated as a "significant, substantial change" in this BAO Restoration Plan for the purposes of Section 6 [Restoration Plan Implementation], below, and will be subject to the same review and public comment steps before its final approval by the Governor as provided for in Section 6.

Consistent with the 2012 BAO Plan, this Preliminary Conceptual Restoration Plan (PCRP) is only a step towards a more definitive plan to describe the restoration of the historic Upper Silver Bow Creek corridor.

1.2. Role of the BNRC and Public

This PCRP describes preliminary conceptual restoration approaches for restoration of the Upper Silver Bow Creek corridor.

This PCRP, though preliminary, provides direction to NRDP in the development of a revised and updated draft Conceptual Restoration Plan. Consistent with Section 6 of the 2012 BAO Plan, NRDP will continue to apprise BNRC members

The State retains and reserves all rights and authorities, including, but not limited to, those related to the BPSOU Record of Decision and BPSOU potentially responsible parties. This includes, but is not limited to, the groundwater and surface water components of the BPSOU Record of Decision remedy.

to protect groundwater and surface water resources. As the State may advocate, absent a consent decree and further funding, that further actions similar to those considered in this document are necessary to protect groundwater and surface water resources as part of remedy, complementary actions may or may not include actions similar to those considered in this document.

and the public on the continuing development of the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s), to the extent permissible under consent decree negotiations requirements of confidentiality. NRDP will also continue its work with all stakeholders as it develops the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s).

The draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s) would be attached upon lodging to a BPSOU consent decree. Prior to consent decree lodging, the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s) would be subject to consideration of the input of the Trustee Restoration Council, the BNRC, NRDP, and the public, consistent with Section 6 of the 2012 BAO Plan.

The draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s) would also be subject to public comment upon lodging. Similarly to the 2007 Butte Area One Draft Conceptual Restoration Plan, the State, with the Governor as Trustee, would reserve its right to withdraw from or withhold its consent to the consent decree if the comments regarding the Conceptual Restoration Plan disclose facts or considerations which indicate that the plan is inappropriate, improper, or inadequate.

The State requires that any consent decree resulting from the BPSOU consent decree negotiations be fair, reasonable, in the public interest, and consistent with the goals of CERCLA. This includes the appropriate coordination of remedy implementation with State restoration requirements, and the inclusion of additional appropriate funding sources for the plan.

Should the consent decree be approved, NRDP would proceed to the next phase, which is refinement and validation of the Conceptual Restoration Plan with additional field data, analyses and surveys. This would lead to the final design phase, which would provide detailed design drawings and information adequate to implement the projects. Restoration implementation would then follow design. NRDP anticipates that the time from entry to restoration completion would take several years.

The State's goal is successful negotiation of a BPSOU consent decree. However, should BPSOU consent decree negotiations fail, NRDP would then discuss options with the BNRC as well as the public, consistent with Section 6 of the 2012 BAO Plan, regarding expenditures of the historic Upper Silver Bow Creek corridor funding. Such discussions would focus on those actions which complement, rather than replace, future remedy actions deemed necessary by the State to protect groundwater and surface water resources.

1.3. Butte Area One Overview

The deposition of wastes within the City of Butte from mining and mineralprocessing operations has resulted in injury to groundwater and surface water resources of the Silver Bow Creek watershed.

The identified injured alluvial groundwater and surface water within Butte is located in the south central portion of the Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit, referred to as Butte Area One (BAO). The BAO is depicted in the red-outlined area on **Figure 1**. Many of the wastes in BAO are associated with five facilities – the Parrot Smelter, the Metro Storm Drain (MSD), the Butte Reduction Works, the Colorado Smelter, active mining area, and the Berkeley Pit. The Metro Sub-drain is a slotted PVC drain system located directly under the MSD, constructed to collect shallow near drain contaminated groundwater.

Injury to groundwater in BAO has been demonstrated by the occurrence of concentrations of inorganic contaminants (including cadmium, zinc, iron, lead, copper, arsenic, and sulfate) that exceed State water quality standards in the alluvial aquifer. The areal extent of the known contamination above these standards in the alluvial aquifer is approximately one square mile.

The concentration of copper in Parrot Tailings area groundwater can exceed 1,000,000 parts per billion (ppb). Similarly, the concentration of zinc and cadmium can exceed 500,000 ppb and 2,000 ppb respectively. These extremely high concentrations are rivaled in the Upper Clark Fork River Basin only by the leach pad operations at the active mining site in Butte. The concentration of copper in the Parrot Tailings area groundwater can be as much as fifteen times greater than Berkeley Pit water contaminant concentrations.

In the Diggings East and Northside Tailings areas, some samples from the original soil horizon (organic silt) on which these wastes were deposited contain in excess of 2% copper and 2% zinc. A total mass of over 3,000,000 pounds of copper and 7,000,000 pounds of zinc are estimated to be contained in the unsaturated zone in these areas.

At the Blacktail Creek berm area, which forms the bank of the Blacktail Creek floodplain, NRDP's initial limited investigation showed elevated contaminant concentrations, with copper and zinc concentrations typically ranging from 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 ppb.

These tailings and wastes will continue to release hazardous substances to groundwater, and potentially surface water, in the historic Upper Silver Bow Creek area for many centuries, if not thousands of years.



Figure 1 Butte Area One Overview.

1.4. Conceptual Restoration Plan Objectives

The objectives for removing the mine wastes left in place are set forth in the 2012 BAO Plan, and will guide the development of the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s). The objectives are to:

- Eliminate known sources of inorganic contamination to alluvial groundwater and surface water;
- Restore the area to a beneficial end use;
- Enhance the area riparian corridors; and
- Improve the quality of the fishery in Blacktail and Upper Silver Bow Creeks.

1.5. PRCP Content and Scope

The purposes of the PCRP are to:

- Further, and be consistent with the 2012 BAO Plan;
- Lead to development of a draft Conceptual Restoration Plan that would not adversely impact the remedy in significant ways;
- Remain consistent with natural resource damage provisions and other applicable requirements;
- Identify likely removal areas and waste types, and estimate waste volumes;
- Take into account the potential and current needs for wet weather management including retention/detention basins and other stormwater elements as directed under Remedy;
- Identify land access and ownership;
- Identify potential end land use;
- Identify data or information gaps and describe plans to address them;
- Include a preliminary general schedule; and
- Reasonably balance any conflicting needs.

To support these purposes, this PCRP is organized into the following sections:

- Section 1. Introduction. Provides project background, descriptions of the project area setting and resources that are important relative to restoration potential.
- Section 2. Parrot Tailings. Provides descriptions of anticipated excavation of tailings/impacted materials and proposed potential end land use for the area.
- Section 3. Diggings East and Northside Tailings. Provides descriptions of the anticipated excavation of

tailings/impacted materials and proposed end land use alternatives for the area.

- Section 4. Blacktail Berm. Provides descriptions of the anticipated excavation of tailings/impacted materials and proposed end land use alternatives for the Blacktail Berm and associated wetland areas.
- Section 5. Summary Cost Estimates of PCRP Alternatives. Provides summary cost estimates of the alternatives.
- Section 6. Data and Analysis Needs. Provides an assessment of data gaps.
- Section 7. References.

1.6. Assumptions

In order to better illustrate PCRP options and encourage further dialogue, the draft PCRP includes preliminary assumptions and estimates, with certain assumptions yet to be borne out. For example, the PCRP assumes landowner acceptance and legal access to removal and repository properties, though NRDP discussions with landowners have been very preliminary to date. The PCRP also includes assumptions in discussions of future end land use, though discussions with interested stakeholders have been preliminary. All assumptions and estimates made in the draft PCRP will be further developed and advanced through discussion and input following issuance of this draft PCRP.

1.7. Summary of Changes to Draft PCRP

In early November, NRDP distributed the draft PCRP, seeking input on the draft from the public, the BNRC and other various stakeholders, including certain parties involved in the ongoing confidential BPSOU Consent Decree (CD) negotiations. The NRDP also met with many of these interested parties. The NRDP subsequently received written input on the draft PCRP, as well as input during the various meetings, from a number of these parties. All input was considered, and the PCRP has been revised to incorporate much of this input.

The input received and how it was addressed can be categorized into four primary categories: 1) input resulting in revisions to the draft PCRP; 2) input beyond the scope of the PCRP but that will help provide direction to NRDP in the development of a revised and updated draft Conceptual Restoration Plan(s) (CRP); 3) technical input that will be discussed and resolved as part of the development of a revised draft CRP or in the design phase of the restoration

projects; and 4) input that did not result in changes to the PCRP, and which will not be incorporated in the development of a revised draft CRP.

In light of the input received from a number of entities on certain end land use alternatives contained in the draft PCRP, the NRDP has indicated in the text regarding these alternatives, that these alternatives, or certain components of alternatives, likely will not be carried forward in revised and updated drafts of the CRP. These alternatives, however, were left in the PCRP for the sake of efficiency in finalizing this PCRP and so that they can remain for potential consideration as the revised CRP is developed. These alternatives, or alternative components, that likely will not be carried forward as part of the CRP are: 1) the depressional park in the Parrot Tailings removal area; 2) moving portions of MSD (i.e., the MSD would be left in its current location and condition); and open water ponds in the Diggings East area.

NRDP will develop more specific repository locations, transport methods, and cost estimates including cost ranges for the removal actions during development of a revised and updated draft CRP. NRDP will also incorporate new data as it becomes available to assist in defining the nature and extent of the waste materials. NRDP will also continue its coordination with the relevant parties regarding future remedy needs, including potential stormwater controls.

Also, as discussed in Section 1.2 above, NRDP will continue to apprise and work with the BNRC, the public and the other stakeholders on the continuing development of the draft CRP, subject to the confidentiality requirements of CD negotiations.

2. PARROT TAILINGS PROJECT

2.1. Tailings/Contaminated Materials Removal

2.1.1. Removal Activities

For the purposes of this draft PCRP, tailings and contaminated soils within the Parrot Tailings complex were characterized from 44 bore log records previously compiled for MBMG Open File Report #590 (MBMG 2010). Boring locations and identifiers are presented on The typical profile of materials expressed in the bore holes within the Parrot Tailings area includes a layer of tailings from one half to more than twelve feet thick (average 4.8') that is underlain by a layer of native, organic rich soils (average 2.1' thick) that have become contaminated by leaching from the tailings above. These contaminated materials are buried beneath one to more than twenty feet (average 12.6') of non-tailings overburden materials, including waste rock and smelter slag. Material volumes were estimated by creating lithologic unit boundary surfaces from these borehole data, and calculating the volume of each unit between the boundary surfaces using ArcView 3D Analyst and/or AutoCAD Civil 3D software.

Leachability tests performed by the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology (MBMG 2010) indicate that while Arsenic, Cadmium, Copper, Lead and Zinc are leachable from all of these materials, the tailings in particular produce leachate having metals concentrations above EPA designated Maximum Contaminate Levels and the Montana Department of Environmental Quality established Secondary Maximum Contaminate Levels for drinking water. The same leachability tests demonstrate that the organic rich native soils that have become contaminated by overlying tailings produce leachate that has higher concentration of copper and cadmium than that produced by the tailings themselves. Conversely, the waste rock and slag materials demonstrated much lower leachability under the acid rain conditions simulated by the tests, producing leachate that is a factor of two to two orders of magnitude lower in COC concentration than that produced by the Parrot tailings. Accordingly the vertical extent of the tailings and contaminated materials removal assumed by this PCRP for the Parrot Tailings area would be defined by lithologic unit, and not by site specific material concentrations. Included in the removal action would be removal of tailings, removal of contaminated, organic rich "black clays" from beneath tailings deposits, and removal of any intervening soil horizons between tailings and the contaminated, organic rich "black clays". Overburden materials including clean soil, waste rock, and slag - would be respoiled on site.



Figure 2.

The horizontal extent of the tailings and contaminated materials removal for the Parrot Tailings complex assumed by this draft PCRP is as used in the Final Focused Feasibility Study for the Metro Storm Drain, Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit (EPA 2004) for the Total Removal Option, with the following infrastructure-protection related adjustments:

- 1. Removal would not be performed beneath or beyond the railways that bound the northeast and northwest sides of the current Civic Center Parking lot/Ball field area north of Civic Center Road. Removing tailings from beneath and between the rail bed and ballast, elevated rail embankment, and roadways is expected to be cost prohibitive.
- 2. Removal would not be performed beneath the footprint of the Metro Storm Drain (MSD). It is assumed that most of the tailings and contaminated materials that may have been present in this area would have been removed during the construction of the MSD and MSD sub-drain construction, and that disturbing the remedy infrastructure to get at the tailings that may remain would not be warranted.
- 3. Removal would not be performed beneath the Civic Center building or its associated paved parking areas north and south of Civic Center road. Boreholes in this area typically show no tailings or thin (less than 1' thick) tailings, some of which have already been removed in the course of maintenance activities on Civic Center facilities. Disturbing the substantial Civic Center infrastructure, as well as City utilities (water, sewer, and storm sewer including a Hydro Dynamic Device) to get at the tailings that may remain would not be warranted.
- 4. Removal activities would not take place in areas where borings show no presence of tailings or contaminated materials. Five boreholes in the northeast of the Parrot Tailings complex (B-1 to B-3, Ball Field 1 & 2) indicate fill with slag and other overburden, but an absence of tailings and contaminated materials. The area in the vicinity of these boreholes was excluded from the tailings and contaminated removal area.

Accounting for these adjustments, the tailings and contaminated materials removal area is presented on Figure 3. This area is further subdivided into primary and secondary removal areas. The bulk of removal activities would take place in the primary removal area, which encompasses the current ball field area north of Civic Center road, and the City Shop Complex south of Civic Center road. Limited, if any, removal activities would be performed in the secondary removal area, southeast of the MSD in the area of the current City park that houses the Texas Avenue Hydro Dynamic Device (HDD). Borings indicate limited tailings impacts in this area, much of which has likely been removed during construction of the existing storm sewer, HDD, and City park. Limited additional

removal in this area would be considered, provided that it could be achieved cost effectively without endangering this infrastructure.

The Parrot Tailings removal area encompasses approximately 33 acres. From within this area, approximately 270,000 cubic yards of tailings and contaminated materials are assumed to be removed and disposed of off-site. To access those wastes, approximately 675,000 cubic yards of overburden would need to be excavated and replaced on-site. Existing conditions cross-sections displaying the layering of wastes and overburden for cross-sections A and B from Figure 3 are presented on Figure 4 and Figure 5, respectively. Land ownership of the Parrot Tailings project footprint and surrounding areas, from Montana Cadastral, is presented on Figure 6.

Removal of the Parrot Tailings would require demolition and removal of the City Shop Complex, which would be relocated off-site per the desires of Butte Silver-Bow. Tailings removal would also include most of the ball field area.

Within the footprint of the removal are several utilities, including electric, water, sanitary sewer and storm water lines. Utilities associated with the current City Shop Complex are expected to be removed and replaced only if deemed necessary to serve elements of the restoration. Utilities that transit the site, including the storm sewer line, are expected to be retained or replaced. The two HDDs would be left undisturbed, and maintenance access maintained. The Metro Storm Drain and MSD sub-drain are excluded from the removal area, and would not be expected to be disturbed by removal activities. Civic Center road would be closed during the removal action, demolished to remove tailings beneath, and replaced on its current alignment.

It is anticipated that dewatering may be necessary to accomplish some of the tailings/contaminated materials removal and restoration backfill activities. Dewatering needs were estimated by comparing the groundwater elevation recorded in the borehole logs used for determining the contaminated materials excavation. The results of this comparison (approximately 9 acres of saturated materials, inundated to an average depth of approximately 2 feet) is presented on Figure 7. Assuming a 20% porosity of these contaminated materials would equal a dewatering rate of less than 120 gallons/minute for a week to initially dewater these leachable wastes.



Figure 2 Borehole locations, Parrot Tailings Project Area

It is noted however, that the borehole logs in question predate the installation of the MSD, during a period of generally wetter climatology. Groundwater conditions at the time of restoration implementation are expected to be different and more data would need to be collected for further analysis. For the purposes of this draft PCRP and its costing assumptions, the original borehole data based inundation was used as a conservative assumption.

2.1.2. Transport and Disposal Options

Two transport methods, truck haul and slurry pipeline, might be used to remove the tailings and contaminated materials from the Parrot Tailings project area to a permanent repository. Truck haul is generally more expensive, and may utilize public streets, which increases the risk to public safety from potential vehicle accidents. Transport by slurry pipeline is generally less expensive and eliminates potential noise, dust and the possibility of vehicle accidents associated with haul trucks, but does require significant quantities of water to operate. Provision for handling the contaminated decant water would have to be made at the repository location, the cost of which would effectively prevent the use of a slurry pipeline for transport to some potential repository locations. As a permanent repository location for the Parrot Tailings waste materials remains unknown at this time, this PCRP assumes for costing purposes that tailings and contaminated materials would be transported from the site by street legal haul trucks to a repository location not more than 2.5 miles from the site.

Repository location and transport method will be addressed in the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan. NRDP will continue its work with all interested entities in the development of the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan.

2.1.3. Estimated Removal costs

Removal includes the removal of tailings and contaminated materials from the Parrot Tailings using scrapers and excavators, and hauling the tailings to a repository. The tailings removal will require demolition of the existing city shops complex of office and shop buildings, fuel tanks and paved parking areas. The overburden will be excavated and placed on site to the finish grade. The tailings will be capped and revegetated. The total cost for this removal option is estimated to be approximately \$10.8 million (Table1.).



Figure 3 Parrot Tailings Project Area Existing Conditions



Figure 4 Parrot Tailings Project Area Cross Sections, Section A



Figure 5 Parrot Tailings Project Area Cross Sections, Section B

Figure 6 Parrot Tailings Project Area Property Ownership

Figure 7 Parrot Tailings Project Area – Borehole log Based Estimate of Groundwater Saturated Contaminated Materials within the Expected Excavation Area

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
SITE DEMOLITION				
Shop	363,000	CF	\$0.39	\$139,871
Office	125,000	CF	\$0.39	\$48,165
Vehicle Storage (small)	259,200	CF	\$0.19	\$49,937
Vehicle Storage (large)	421,200	CF	\$0.19	\$81,148
Wash Building	55,440	CF	\$0.39	\$21,362
New Bus Barn	114,048	CF	\$0.19	\$21,972
Old Bus Barn	114,048	CF	\$0.19	\$21,972
Pavement Removal	50,336	SY	\$5.68	\$285,959
6' Fence Removal	2,630	LF	\$3.57	\$9,380
Fuel Island	1	LS	\$9,000	\$9,000
Buried 1,500 gal Tanks	2	EA	\$7,415	\$14,830
Misc. Demolition/Removal	1	LS	\$20,000	\$20,000
Sub Total				\$723,598
Design/Engineer Fees 15%				\$108,540
TAILINGS REMOVAL - PARROT				
Stock Pile Topsoil	4,741	CY	\$0.86	\$4,066
Overburden Removal & Replacement	670,894	CY	\$3.00	\$2,015,458
Compact Overburden For Parking Lot and Structures	346,900	CY	\$0.74	\$257,053
Tailings + Organic Clays Dig and Haul	267,173	CY	\$12.07	\$3,223,757
Strip Topsoil at Repository	13,371	CY	\$0.86	\$11,467
Spread Tailings in Repository	267,173	CY	\$3.84	\$1,025,816
Spread Topsoil at Repository	13,371	CY	\$0.86	\$11,467
Revegetate Repsitory	8.29	Acre	\$1,540.00	\$12,763
Cap Tailings	8.29	Acre	\$30,000.00	\$248,628
Dewatering Site	1	LS	\$113,104.00	\$113,104
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
TAILINGS REMOVAL SUBTOTAL				\$6,928,580
Design/Engineer Fees 15%				\$1,039,286.99
TOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIES				\$8,800,005
PROJECT STARTI IR /ENVIRONMENTAL				
	2 50%		\$8 800 005	\$220.000
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$8,800,005	\$79,200
	0.50%		\$8,800,005	\$73,200
Testing/Environmental	2 0.05%		\$8,800,005	\$176.000
Sub Total	2.0070		\$0,000,000	\$550,000
500 10tai				\$550,000
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$9,350.005
Contingency @15%				\$1,402,501
contingency @ 1070				<i>91,402,301</i>
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$10,752,506

Table 1 Parrot Tailings Removal Costs

2.2. Resultant Restoration and End Land Use

One potential end land use alternative for the Parrot Tailings area is shown on Figure 8. This PCRP alternative is intended to address a Butte Silver Bow desire for an expansion of the utility of the Civic Center and nearby areas.

2.2.1. End Land Use Considerations

Butte-Silver Bow has expressed a strong interest in having the restoration of the Parrot Tailings area include expanded parking for the Civic Center north of Civic Center Road (CCR), and a park space south of the CCR. Butte-Silver Bow has also expressed a desire that the park space south of CCR not be raised far

above the level of the MSD, as the current City Shop complex is now. Instead, Butte-Silver Bow has envisioned a park space that more gradually slopes from Civic Center road down to the trail that runs atop the berm of the MSD.

After additional consideration and light of input from BSB on the draft PCRP, the depressional park, parking area and pit toilet south of Civic Center Road, as shown on Figure 8, likely will not be taken forward when developing the CRP for the Parrot Tailings removal area.

This PCRP option approximately doubles the area available for parking lot construction north of Civic Center Road. Under this option, the Restoration Fund would replace the paving for the 425 current parking spaces, and provide sufficient well graded and compacted base sufficient for a minimum 425 additional spaces that could be developed by Butte-Silver Bow. South of Civic Center Road, the PRCP provides a gently rolling, 13.75 acre park space with a quarter mile of walking paths that connect to the existing footpath atop the MSD.

Achieving the lower final grade for the park space south of Civic Center Road while still spoiling the Parrot overburden on-site would require raising the average grade of the area north of Civic Center road. Placing all of the relocated overburden within the footprint of the tailings excavation north of Civic Center road would raise its elevation substantially from the current condition, complicating the design of a contiguous parking lot space and potentially requiring Civic Center road to be reconstructed even higher than its current elevation. To avoid these circumstances, the PCRP option instead places much of the relocated overburden within the footprint of the current Civic Center parking lot, providing for a single level parking lot space, and allowing lower elevations for the rest of the site.

Overall, the PCRP option:

- lowers the crest of Civic Center Road by four feet
- lowers the elevation of the current Parrot waste pile north of Civic Center road (i.e. the ball field area) by 6-8 feet
- raises the elevation of the current Civic Center parking lot by 10-12 feet
- lowers the base elevation of the current City Shop Complex area by 17 feet, putting the average elevation of the resulting park on par with the existing greenway trail that runs along the MSD.

Conceptual cross-sections illustrating the surface of the parking lot and City park facilities with respect to cross sections A and B from Figure 8 are presented on Figure 4 and Figure 5. Note that Figure 4 and Figure 5 are engineering cross sections, drawn with a substantial vertical exaggeration (10:1) to facilitate interpretation of the tailings, overburden, and other lithologic features. Figure 4 thus does not accurately depict the final configuration of the park option. Figure 9

presents that portion of cross section A that transects the park, drawn to a 1:1 scale that better conveys what the park space would look like on the ground.

Total relief across the width of the proposed park area would be 12 feet, providing visual interest and recreational opportunity. All slopes would be held to 10:1 or shallower for negotiability by the public, and the proposed trails would meet ADA accessibility guidelines.

After additional input from BSB and others the depressional park, parking lot, and restroom will not be carried forward in development of the CRP.

The option would balance cut and fill across the site and relocate a large percentage of the overburden material north of CCR, where it would be placed under a low permeability paved parking lot. The final grading of the area both north and south of the lowered Civic Center Road would be configured to provide positive drainage to a stormwater collection system, maintaining the existing delivery of precipitation runoff from this area to the MSD surface drain instead of increasing infiltration and loading to the MSD sub-drain. If the ultimate end land use for the Parrot Tailings area requires irrigation (as for recreation fields or lawn, a closed loop system will be considered if necessary to prevent an excessive increase in infiltration from irrigation. The MSD sub-drain, and the substantial utility infrastructure buried adjacent to the MSD beneath the existing footpath would remain undisturbed by this PCRP option.

The MSD and the area east of the MSD, in the vicinity of the current City park and the location of the storm sewer system's Texas Avenue Hydro Dynamic Device, would be expected to receive minimal work – principally removal of small tailings deposits that may have not been addressed previously.

2.2.2. Resultant Restoration and End Land Use Costs

The cost estimate for the resultant restoration option of the Parrot Tailings site includes the cost of reconstruction of the city shops complex and baseball field² at other sites in Butte. These new sites have not been proposed or selected but the estimate includes the cost of purchasing land. Major components of the restorations of the Parrot Tailings site include; construction of an expanded Civic Center Parking Lot footprint, importing and placing topsoil, replacement of water, sewer, and stormwater pipelines, and construction of Civic Center Road. Primary placement of overburden to regrade the site is included in the removal cost estimation. As shown in Table 2, the cost for this part of the Parrot Tailings restoration project option is estimated to be \$12.5 million. Taken together with the removal cost (Table 1), the total project cost is estimated to be \$23.2 million.

² Including a ball field replacement cost in this option is not meant to imply that this item is not subject to further discussion.

Figure 8 Parrot Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative

Preliminary Conceptual Restoration Plan - Butte Area One

REACE, MARCONSTRUCT MAGEImage <th>ITEM</th> <th>QUANTITY</th> <th>UNIT</th> <th>UNIT PRICE</th> <th>CITY COST INDEX</th> <th>UNIT PRICE</th> <th>Reference #</th> <th>Referenced Location</th> <th>TOTAL PRICE</th>	ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	CITY COST INDEX	UNIT PRICE	Reference #	Referenced Location	TOTAL PRICE
baseJat.00<	RELOCATE/RECONSTRUCT BLDGS								
Office4.6404.6405.745.745.13.003.34.040 belains5.01.2.62Valcis Storg town storge)2.4.003.2.003.706.0.05.1.3.83.0Added influion5.0.2.6.0Valcis Storg town storge)2.4.003.706.05.1.3.83.0Added influion5.0.3.8.7Nor Balang1.11.11.11.01.04.1.0.0.01.04.1.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.0.	Shop	16,500	SF			\$127.85	3	Added Inflation	\$2,109,509
Vebick Storage box storageNumber of the storageStorage<	Office	4,694	SF			\$130.03	3	ADded Inflation	\$610,382
Vebic Space of the standSpace <td>Vehicle Storage (cold storage)</td> <td>14,400</td> <td>SF</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$63.38</td> <td>3</td> <td>Added Inflation</td> <td>\$912,646</td>	Vehicle Storage (cold storage)	14,400	SF			\$63.38	3	Added Inflation	\$912,646
Numbin Numbin Numbin Description5.879.879.889	Vehicle Storage (warm storage)	23,400	SF			\$63.38	3	Added Inflation	\$1,483,049
New BailNew BailNew BailNew BailNew BailNew BailAdded IndianStatusBowene15500.880.880.8718.046ed IndianStatusBreneg2,2001.7755.000.880.880.8718.0400 (11.23.23 000.51.12.23StatusBreneg2,2001.7855.000.880.880.8718.2400 (11.23.23 000.51.12.23StatusBreneg2,2001.60.880.8857.84.5813.243 0.23.23 000.51.12.23StatusBreneg1.60.160.1651.06.540.16Status57.84.540.16StatusStatusBrender1.60.160.1657.84.540.16Status<	Wash Building	2,520	SF			\$81.95	3	Added Inflation	\$206,525
Old BabminhormJ.T.J.T.J.T.J.S.B.20	New Bus Barn	1	LS			\$418,954.81	3	Added Inflation	\$418,955
pawnetpawnet53.000.83.000.83.000.12.32.00.01.31.230.59.03Feeding2.800VI0.8000.23.01.000.0	Old Bus Barn	1	LS			\$418,954.81	3	Added Inflation	\$418,955
FieringPertuals and the set of	Pavement	2,793	SY	\$36.20	0.988	\$35.77	1	6.13; 0200, 32 11 23.23 0100, 31 23 23.	\$99,893
nucliand puelland paneland pa	Fencing	2,630	LF			\$28.00	1	32 31' 13.20; 0200	\$73,640
abeulangia latifiels11516513,84.54SatureAdded million513,85.54skortoging171717171712 <t< td=""><td>Fuel Island, Tanks</td><td>1</td><td>LS</td><td></td><td></td><td>\$87,418.16</td><td>1</td><td>Added Inflation</td><td>\$87,418</td></t<>	Fuel Island, Tanks	1	LS			\$87,418.16	1	Added Inflation	\$87,418
Landscoping1151515052,00002Latinated52,000155	Rebuilding Ball fields	1	LS			\$218,545.40	Estimated	Added Inflation	\$218,545
sixe TotalImage <td>Landscaping</td> <td>1</td> <td>LS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$25,000.00</td> <td>2</td> <td>Estimated</td> <td>\$25,000</td>	Landscaping	1	LS			\$25,000.00	2	Estimated	\$25,000
Mac. ConsMax. ConsMax. BarMax.	Sub Total								\$6,664,518
Misc. ContsMisc. ContsMisc. Site WorkInc.Misc. Site WorkInc.Misc. Site WorkInc.Misc. Site WorkMisc. S									
Mix. Site Work1ISImageSubSubSub StabsModed inflationS218.55 absSub Trake autor for New Buildings200ACRESImageSubSub StabsSub StabsS	Misc. Costs								
Purchase land for New Building-20AGRESImageImageSub 2012ImageAdded inflationS212,54.5Sub TetalImageImageImageImageImageImageImageS200,000S200,	Misc. Site Work	1	LS			\$21,854.54		Added inflation	\$21,855
sub TealImage<	Purchase Land For New Buildings	20	ACRES			\$10,927.27		Added inflation	\$218,545
Image: Angen transmissionImage: Angen transmissio	Sub Total								\$240,400
PARROTTALUNGS RESTORATIONIndIndIndIndIndIndIndIndIndSpread Topoil (On Site Source)4,471CYCS0.862Table 1.154,077Spread Topoil (On Site Source)19,495CYCS0.862Table 1.154,077Construct Tok Center Road1,408LFCS314.742Table 20S443.159Construct Takling (of Wide Gravel)429CAR52,320.000.88\$2,221.61R5Means 2020 214.1990S983.337Construct Takling (Wide Gravel)1,500LFCS5.772Table 3S6,567Install New Water Main (G* PVC)500LFCS1,230.01R5Means 2014 G3010 22.540S10,652Replex Somo Drain (35* CMP)1,003LFCS1,510.02Table 3S6,627Replex Somo Drain (35* CMP)1,003LFCS1,540.002Table 21S91,505Install New Sweet Main (G* PVC)1ACRESS5,152.160.988S5,082.22Table 21S91,500Install Power Lines15ACRESS5,152.160.988S5,082.22R5Means 28 42.310.000S91,323Intrigation System1ECCS5,000CTable 2S93,037Contor Cost BEORE CONTINGENCESICCCS2,330,137CS92,335,05CS92,335,05CS92,335,05Performance Bond0.09%I <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
Spreat DipoleModel<	PARROT TAILINGS RESTORATION								
import and Place Topsoil19.459CYCYCS33.702Table 105655,701Construct Parking Iot1.408VIVIS31.742Table 205453,159Construct Parking Iot429CARS\$2,220.000.988\$2,221.611RS Means 2020 21.1995983,357Construct Parking Iot1.500UIVICARS\$5,7772Table 13\$58,657Install New Mark Main (5' PVC)500UIIIRS Means 2014 63010 122.5401\$50,657Install New Sever Main (5' PVC)500UIIIStone\$51,232Table 21\$51,657Install New Sever Main (5' PVC)500UIIIStone\$51,332Table 23\$58,627Replace Storm Drain (3C' CMP)1.003UIVIC\$51,332Table 23\$58,627Install New Sever Main (5' PVC)1.003UIIIStone\$51,332Table 23\$58,627Replace Storm Drain (3C' CMP)1.003UIVIC\$51,332Table 23\$58,627Install New Sever Main (5' PVC)1.003IIKR Stens 20002Estimate\$50,000Replace Storm Drain (3C' CMP)1.003ACRESSe,162.160.988\$6,68,222RS Means 284 23.10.100\$91,323Irrigation System15ACRESSe,162.160.988\$6,68,221RS Means 284 23.10.100\$91,323Total Pacie Cost BEFORE CONTINGENCES<	Spread Topsoil (On Site Source)	4,741	CY			\$0.86	2	Table 1.1	\$4,077
Construct Civic Center Road1,403LFImage: Signame Construct Tails (Signame Cons	Import and Place Topsoil	19,459	CY			\$33.70	2	Table 10	\$655,701
Construct Parking Lot442CARS\$2,320.000.988\$2,222.161RS Means g2020 214.1990\$983.337Construct Parking (6* Wide Gravel)1,500LF\$5.772Table 13\$8,657Install New Mater Main (6* WC)500LF\$5.771RS Means g2020 214.1980\$8,657Install New Mater Main (6* PVC)500LF\$5.771Table 13\$8,627Install New Sever Main (6* PVC)500LF\$5.771Table 23\$98,627Install New Sever Main (6* PVC)1.03LF\$5,000.002Table 23\$98,627Replace Storm Drain (36* CMP)1.05LK\$5.000.002Table 23\$98,627Install New Sever Main (6* PVC)1LS\$5,000.002Table 23\$98,627Replace Storm Drain (36* CMP)1LS\$5,000.002Table 23\$98,627Replace Storm Drain (36* CMP)1ACRES\$6,162.160.988\$5,000.002Table 14\$23,100Install New Storm Drain (36* CMP)1ACRES\$6,162.160.988\$5,000.001RS Means 20 423,1000\$91,323Forsion Control1KAACRES\$6,162.160.988\$5,000.001RS Means 20 423,0100\$91,323\$2\$7,850,100TOTAL PROJECT COT SECORE CONTINCENCIES1KKKKK\$9,235,055	Construct Civic Center Road	1,408	LF			\$314.74	2	Table 20	\$443,159
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravei)1,500LFImageImageS5.772Table 13S8,657Install New Water Main (6' PVC)500LFImageS21.301R5 Means 2014 G301 022.5410S5,6527Replace Storm Drain (36' CMP)1,003LFImageS5,0002Table 23S5,6527Install New Sever Main (G' PVC)11,003LFImageS5,0002Table 23S5,6527Replace Storm Drain (36' CMP)1,003LFImageS5,0002Table 21S5,000Install New Sever Main (G' PVC)1LSSS5,0002Table 21S5,000Install New Sever Main (G' PVC)1LSSS5,0002Table 23S5,000Install New Sever Main (G' PVC)1LSSS5,162.160.988S6,088.222R5 Means 22 84 23.100.00S5,000Inrigation System1EACS5,000.001RS Means 22 84 23.100.00S5,000.00Irrigation System1EASS5,000.001RS Means 25 84 23.500.00S5,000.00ContoriolSubtati1EAImageS5,000.001RS Means 25 84 23.500.00S5,000.00ContoriolSubtatiImageImageS5,000.00ImageS5,000.00ImageS5,000.00ContoriolSubtatiImageImageImageImageS5,000.00ImageS5,000.00Instar ContoriolSubtatiImage <t< td=""><td>Construct Parking Lot</td><td>429</td><td>CARS</td><td>\$2,320.00</td><td>0.988</td><td>\$2,292.16</td><td>1</td><td>RS Means g2020 214.1990</td><td>\$983,337</td></t<>	Construct Parking Lot	429	CARS	\$2,320.00	0.988	\$2,292.16	1	RS Means g2020 214.1990	\$983,337
Install New Water Main (6° PVC)500LFImage Mater Main (6° PVC)RS Means 2014 G3010 122.5410\$10,652Install New Sever Main (6° PVC)500LFS17.251Table 23\$56,627Install New Sever Main (6° PVC)S17.252Table 21\$59,1505Install New Sever Main (6° PVC)1LSS17.252Table 21\$59,1050Install Power Lines11LSS1S1S1S1S22Table 21\$59,000Revegetation15ACRESS6,62.160.988\$50,0022RS Means 24 23,1001\$59,123Irrigation System11EAS6,62.160.988\$50,0021RS Means 24 23,30100\$59,302Erosion Control11EAS6,62.160.988\$50,0021RS Means 24 23,30100\$59,303Total PROLECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIES1EACS50,0021RS Means 24 23,30100\$59,303PORICT TATUP/ENVIRONMENTAL1EAII	Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	1,500	LF			\$5.77	2	Table 13	\$8,657
Install New Sewer Main (§* PVC)5000LFImage New FMain (§* PVC)Table 23\$8,627Replace Storm Drain (§* CMP)1,003LFImage New FMain (§* PVC)2Table 21\$91,505Replace Storm Drain (§* CMP)1LSStom O\$2Estimate Meet Stom O\$5,00020Estimate Meet Stom ORevegetation15ACRESSch.612.60.988\$5,080.202Table 14\$23,100\$91,323Irrigotion System11ACRESSch.612.60.988\$5,080.201RS Means 22 &42.31.0010\$91,323Erosion Control11ACRESSch.612.60.988\$5,080.201RS Means 22 &42.31.0010\$91,323Tota Processor1MCRESSch.612.60.988\$5,080.201RS Means 22 &42.31.0010\$91,323Erosion Control1Image NetworkImage NetworkSch.002.00Image NetworkImage Network\$91,323Tota Processor1Image NetworkSch.002.00Image NetworkImage Network\$91,323Tota ProcessorImage NetworkImage NetworkSch.002.00Image NetworkImage Network\$91,323Tota ProcessorImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkSch.002.00Image NetworkImage Network\$92,350.00Image NetworkImage NetworkTota ProcessorImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage NetworkImage Network<	Install New Water Main (6" PVC)	500	LF			\$21.30	1	RS Means 2014 G3010 122.5410	\$10,652
Replace Storm Drain (36" CMP)1,003LFImageImageSp1.232Table 21Sp1.505install Power Lines1LLSS5,000.002EstimateS5,000.00Revegetation15ACRESS6,162.160.988S6,088.222RS Means 32.84.23.10.0100S91.323Erosion Control11EAC0.988S5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10.0100S91.323Erosion Control11EAImageS5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10.0100S91.323TOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCESImageImageImageS5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10.0100S91.323PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTALImageImageImageImageImageS9.235.055ImageImageS9.235.055Performance Bond1.00%ImageImageS9.235.055ImageImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055Insurance0.03%ImageImageS9.235.055ImageImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055ImageS9.235.055Image <td>Install New Sewer Main (6" PVC)</td> <td>500</td> <td>LF</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$17.25</td> <td>1</td> <td>Table 23</td> <td>\$8,627</td>	Install New Sewer Main (6" PVC)	500	LF			\$17.25	1	Table 23	\$8,627
Install Power Lines1LSNCM\$\$,000.002Estimate\$\$,000.00Revegetation15ACRESNCM\$1,54.002Table 14\$23,100Irrigation System15ACRES\$6,162.160.988\$6,082.202RS Means 32 84 23.10 0100\$91,323Ensoin Control1EANCM55,000.001RS Means 32 84 23.10 0100\$52,330,137Control1EANCMS5,000.001RS Means\$52,330,137Control1EANCMInternet\$5,000.00Internet\$52,330,137ControlInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetControlInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetInternetPROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTALInternetInternetInternetS9,235,055InternetS9,235,055Instrance0.09%InternetS9,235,055InternetS9,235,055InternetS9,235,055Instrance0.09%InternetS9,235,055InternetS1,84,700S1,84,700Design/Environmental0.09%InternetS9,235,055InternetS1,84,700Design/Environmental0.09%InternetS9,235,055InternetS1,84,700Design/Environmental0.09%InternetS9,235,055InternetS1,85,704Continger Ge15%InternetInternetInternetInternetS1,85,704	Replace Storm Drain (36" CMP)	1,003	LF			\$91.23	2	Table 21	\$91,505
Revegetation15ACRESInternationStandStandStandStandStandIrrigation System15ACRESStand0.988StandStandStandStandStandErosino Control1EAEAInternationStandStandStandStandStandStandErosino ControlSubTotalInternationInternationInternationInternationStandStandStandStandStandTOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIESInternationInternatio	Install Power Lines	1	LS			\$5,000.00	2	Estimate	\$5,000
Irrigation System15ACRES\$6,162.160.988\$6,088.222RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$91,323Erosion Control1EAC\$5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$91,323ControlSub TotalCC\$5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$50,000ControlSub TotalCCC\$5,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$50,000ControlSub TotalCCCC\$50,000.001RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$50,000ControlSub TotalCCCCC\$50.000.00\$10RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$50,000.00ControlSub TotalCCCCC\$50.000.00\$10RS Means 32.84.23.10 0100\$50.000.00ControlControlCCCCCC\$50.000.00\$10\$50.000.00ControlControlCCCCCC\$50.230.05CC\$50.230.05ProleC STATUP/ENVIRONMENTAL0.90%CCSS9.235.055CC\$50.230.05\$50.00\$50.230.05S\$50.00\$50.230.05\$50.00\$50.230.05\$10.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$50.230.05\$10.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.847.00\$51.857.06\$51.857.06\$51.857.06\$51.857.06<	Revegetation	15	ACRES			\$1,540.00	2	Table 14	\$23,100
Ension Control1EAImage: Signed Signe	Irrigation System	15	ACRES	\$6,162.16	0.988	\$6,088.22	2	RS Means 32 84 23.10 0100	\$91,323
Sub TotalSub Total	Erosion Control	1	EA			\$5,000.00	1	RS Means	\$5,000
Image: constraint of the system of the sys	Sub Total								\$2,330,137
TOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIESIndex <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
Image: constraint of the system of the sys	TOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIES								\$9,235,055
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTALImage: Startup / Start									
Mobilization1.0%Image: Separation of the second of t	PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL								
Performance Bond0.9%00\$9,235,0550\$0\$83,115Insurance0.09%00\$9,235,0550\$0\$7,850Testing/Environmental0.20%0\$0\$9,235,0550\$0\$1,8470Design/Engineer Fees 15%15.00%1\$0\$0\$9,235,0550\$1\$1,385,258Consign/Engineer Fees 15%15.00%1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1,385,258Consign/Engineer Fees 15%11\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1,385,258Consign/Engineer Fees 15%11\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1,385,258Consign/Engineer Fees 15%11\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1\$1,385,258Consign/Engineer Fees 15%11\$1 </td <td>Mobilization</td> <td>1.00%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$9,235,055</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$92,351</td>	Mobilization	1.00%				\$9,235,055			\$92,351
Insurance0.09%00\$9,235,0550\$0\$7,850Testing/Environmental0.20%00\$9,235,0550\$10\$18,470Design/Engineer Fees 15%15.00%15.00%0\$9,235,0550\$10\$1,385,258Sub Total15.00%006\$9,235,0550\$10\$1,385,258Total DESign/CONSTRUCTION10001\$10\$10\$10\$10Contingency @15%100001\$1,623,315\$10\$1,623,315Contingency @15%1000000\$1,623,315	Performance Bond	0.90%				\$9,235,055			\$83,115
Testing/Environmental 0.20% 0 59,235,055 0 0 518,470 Design/Engineer Fees 15% 15.00% 1 500 59,235,055 0 51,385,258 Sub Total 1 0 6 6 59,235,055 0 51,385,258 Total Esign/Construction 6 6 6 6 6 51,87,044 Contingency @15% 6	Insurance	0.09%				\$9,235,055			\$7,850
Design/Engineer Fees 15% 15.00% Image: Construction of the system of th	Testing/Environmental	0.20%				\$9,235,055			\$18,470
Sub Total Image: Construction Image: Construction <t< td=""><td>Design/Engineer Fees 15%</td><td>15.00%</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>\$9,235,055</td><td></td><td></td><td>\$1,385,258</td></t<>	Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%				\$9,235,055			\$1,385,258
Image: Contraction of the system Image: Contraction of t	Sub Total					,,			\$1.587.044
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION Image: construction Image: construction<									
Contingency @15% Image: Control of the second	TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION						1		\$10,822,099
	Contingency @15%						1		\$1,623,315
TOTAL PROJECT COST	TOTAL PROJECT COST								\$12,445,414

 Table 2 Parrot Tailings Restoration Costs

3. DIGGINGS EAST AND NORTHSIDE TAILINGS PROJECT

3.1. Tailings/Contaminated Materials Removal

3.1.1. Removal Actions

For the purposes of this draft PCRP, tailings and contaminated soils within the Diggings East and Northside Tailings (DENST) areas were characterized from 38 (Diggings East) and 10 (Northside Tailings) bore log records previously compiled for the report *Final Draft Version Tailings/Impacted Sediment Delineation of the Diggings East, Blacktail Berm, and Northside Tailings Areas* (NRDP 2014). Boring locations and identifiers are presented in Figure 10.

The typical profile of materials expressed in the bore holes within the Diggings East area includes a layer of tailings from one inch to more than five feet thick (average 1.9') that is often underlain by a layer of native, organic rich soils (average 1.6' thick) that have become impacted by contaminants leached from the tailings deposited above. Beneath the tailings and contaminated organic soil horizon are alluvial sands that extend below the water table to comprise the aquifer substrate. Some of the tailings deposits are exposed at the surface, but most are buried beneath a layer of generally unimpacted landfill material as much as seven feet thick (sample average 4.6'), consisting mostly of demolition debris.

The vertical profile of materials expressed in the bore holes within the Northside Tailings area is very similar to that of the Diggings East area, with the exception of the landfill overburden, which is absent from the Northside Tailings area.

The removal criterion for the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area assumed for this PCRP is based upon the sampled concentration of six contaminants. To each of the six contaminants (As, Cd, Cu, Hg, Pb, and Zn), the tailings/contaminated sediment screening criterion from the Streamside Tailings Operable Unit (SSTOU) was applied. A sample that exceeded the SSTOU screening concentration for more than two of the six contaminants was determined to be contaminated material.

The vertical extent of the tailings and contaminated materials removal assumed by this draft PCRP for the Diggings East and Northside Tailings areas is informed by the fact that within Diggings East, translocation of contaminants into the alluvial sands near the water table was noted at a majority of the sample locations with tailings. For this reason, the tailings/contaminated materials removal on both the Diggings East and Northside Tailings would include removal of tailings and any materials beneath (including contaminated, organic rich "black clays", any intervening soil horizons between tailings and the "black clays", and dry alluvial sands beneath the "black clays") down to the groundwater elevation. For the purposes of this PCRP, the groundwater elevation utilized is that determined by the data from the boreholes presented on Figure 10. Final design will utilized the most current groundwater data available at the time of the design. This PCRP assumes that the landfill overburden materials (wood, concrete, bricks, asphalt pavement, etc.) within Diggings East would be removed from the site if they overlay tailings/contaminated materials deposits, even if the landfill materials themselves are not contaminated. Removal of landfill materials from areas without underlying tailings is not contemplated by this PCRP.

The assumption that all Diggings East landfill materials overlying tailings will be removed from the site is made for three primary reasons:

- 1. Though the great majority of the Diggings East landfill material is uncontaminated by the associated tailings deposits, some of the samples of this material did return contaminant values that exceeded the concentration based removal criteria. Those materials would likely need to be isolated in a repository, and would not be appropriate fill for groundwater contact wetlands. Pending a more comprehensive characterization of the landfill material to determine the proportion that is suitable for wetland fill, the conservative costing assumption is that all of the landfill materials would be removed from the site and placed in a repository.
- 2. Among the restoration options for the Diggings East and Northside Tailings project areas is the restoration of the substantial wetland complex present prior to the placement of the waste materials. Accomplishing this requires removal of substantial quantities of fill material from the site to lower its average elevation, provide groundwater contact, and reestablish wetland hydrology to the site.
- 3. Taking into account the potential and current needs for wet weather management and potential stormwater basins, the Diggings East and Northside Tailings PRCP alternatives avoid creating high fill areas that would interfere with the placement and storage volume of potential catch basins.

Removing the more than estimated 180,000 cubic yards of the landfill materials from the Diggings East project area to a repository would incur a substantial cost. However, if it is determined that the landfill materials are suitable for use as wetland fill, then some of those materials may be used to meet a portion of the backfill requirements for the Diggings East, Northside Tailings, and Blacktail Berm area restorations, offsetting both the cost of the landfill materials removal as well as the backfill purchase and importation cost for those projects. Blacktail Berm PCRP alternatives 1 and 2 would require a minimum 100,000 cubic yards of backfill, while the Northside Tailings area under alternative 2 would require a minimum of 38,000 cubic yards, allowing the majority of Diggings East landfill materials to be economically relocated for those alternatives.

Figure 10 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Borehole Locations

The horizontal extent of the Diggings East and Northside Tailings areas tailings and contaminated materials removal assumed by this PCRP is as presented in the report *Final Draft Version Tailings/Impacted Sediment Delineation of the Diggings East, Blacktail Berm, and Northside Tailings Areas* (MBMG 2014). Those bounds are generally similar to those used in the Final Focused Feasibility study for the Metro Storm Drain, Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit (EPA 2004) for the Total Removal Option, with the following adjustments:

- The removal area on Diggings East was extended to the south across the width of the site, to capture the area represented by those sample locations that failed the concentration based screening criterion for one or more lithologic units.
- The southwest "tail" of the Northside Tailings removal area was truncated, to reflect the fact that two of the three samples taken in that area passed the screening criterion for all lithologic units, and that the one sample location that failed the screening (TP-NS-01E) did so only in the very thin (less than 5") tailings unit observed at this location. Given the proximity of this area to homes and other infrastructure, a removal action does not appear warranted by one isolated tailings deposit with relatively low contaminants values that does not appear to be leaching contaminants to lower units.

Accounting for these adjustments, the tailings and contaminated materials removal area for Diggings East and Northside Tailings assumed by this draft PCRP is presented on Figure 11.

The Diggings East removal area encompasses approximately 24 acres. From within this area, approximately 163,000 cubic yards of tailings and contaminated materials is assumed to be removed and disposed off-site. To access those wastes, approximately 182,000 cubic yards of landfill material overburden would need to be excavated and removed from the site. The Northside Tailings area encompasses approximately 5.5 acres, and the removal action is assumed to entail approximately 56,000 cubic yards of tailings and contaminated material. Surface ownership within the Diggings East and Northside Tailings project footprint and surrounding areas, from Montana Cadastral, is presented on Figure 15.

Existing conditions cross sections displaying the layering of wastes and overburden for cross sections A, B, and C from Figure 10 are presented on Figures Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14 respectively.

Within the footprint of the removal area are several utilities, including electric power lines, a city water main, a sanitary sewer line and storm sewer lines. These utilities are expected to be retained, moved, or replaced. It is assumed for purposes of the draft PCRP that removal of any tailings that may exist beneath George Street is unnecessary. If tailings are present beneath George Street and need to be removed, the PCRP option would not change, but additional removal and restoration cost would be incurred.

Figure 11 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Existing Conditions

Figure 12 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section A

Figure 13 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section B

Figure 14 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PRCP Option Cross Sections, Section C

Figure 15 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, Property Ownership.

3.1.2. Transport and Disposal Options

As with the Parrot Tailings project area, two transport methods, truck haul and slurry pipeline, could be used to remove the tailings and contaminated materials from the Diggings East and Northside Tailings project areas to a permanent repository, but for this PCRP, only the truck haul option to a nearby repository location is evaluated.

Repository location and transport method will be addressed in the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan. NRDP will continue its work with all interested entities in the development of the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan.

3.1.3. Estimated Removal costs

Removal includes the removal of tailings, contaminated materials, and landfill wastes from Diggings' East and Northside Tailings, and hauling to a repository. It is assumed that the wastes from each site will be removed using excavators and on-road haul trucks to transport and spread tailings at the repository. The wastes will be capped and revegetated. The total cost for this removal is estimated to be approximately \$7.6 million. Itemized costs are presented on Table 3 below.

3.2. Resultant Restoration and End Land Use

Two PCRP restoration alternatives are presented for the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area. Alternative 1 would perform a minimalist backfill and regrade of the tailings/contaminated materials excavations, resulting in wetland parklands in both areas, reserving the northern area for BPSOU Record of Decision wet weather retention/detention basins. Alternative 2 would reroute the current MSD surface drain south of George Street into wide riparian swale, providing complex wetland habitat and park space south of George Street, while the area north of George Street would be reserved for BPSOU Record of Decision wet weather retention / detention basins.

Both alternatives assume available acreage could be employed for BPSOU Record of Decision wet weather retention/detention basins and other stormwater features. NRDP notes and acknowledges the importance of addressing the effect of wet weather events on surface water resources.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
TAILINGS REMOVAL - DIGGINGS EAST				
Landfill - Excavate and Haul	181,635	CY	\$8.92	\$1,619,520
Tailings + Organic Clays Dig and Haul	161,832	CY	\$10.61	\$1,717,797
Strip Topsoil at Repository	17,189	CY	\$0.86	\$14,742
Spread Landfill in Repository	181,635	CY	\$3.32	\$602,612
Spread Tailings in Repository	161,832	CY	\$3.95	\$639,180
Spread Topsoil at Repository	17,189	CY	\$0.86	\$14,742
Revegetate Repsitory	10.65	Acre	\$1,540.00	\$16,408
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
Sub Total				\$4,630,000
TAILINGS REMOVAL - NORTHSIDE TAILINGS				
Stock Pile Topsoil	10,400	CY	\$0.86	\$8,919
Tailings + Organic Clays Dig and Haul	45,600	CY	\$11.51	\$525,019
Strip Topsoil at Repository	2,803	CY	\$0.86	\$2,404
Spread Tailings in Repository	45,600	CY	\$3.95	\$180,106
Spread Topsoil at Repository	2,803	CY	\$0.86	\$2,404
Revegetate Repsitory	1.74	Acre	\$1,540.00	\$2,675
Cap Tailings	1.74	Acre	\$30,000.00	\$52,113
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000
Sub Total				\$776,640
TAILINGS REMOVAL SUBTOTAL				\$5,406,640
Design/Engineer Fees 15%				\$810,996.01
TOTAL PROJECT COST BEFORE CONTINGENCIES				\$6,217,636
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$6,217,636	\$155,441
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$6,217,636	\$55,959
Insurance	0.85%		\$6,217,636	\$52,850
Testing/Environmental	2.00%		\$6,217,636	\$124,353
Sub Total				\$388,602
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$6,606,238
Contingency @15%				\$990,936
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$7,597,174

 Table 3 Diggings East and Northside Tailings, Estimated Removal Costs

3.2.1. Alternative 1 End Land Use Considerations

Figure 16 presents the first PCRP alternative for post-tailings removal restoration of the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area. Conceptual cross sections for Alternative 1 for cross sections A, B, and C from Figure 16 are presented on Figures Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14 respectively.

Under this alternative, only limited areas would be backfilled to an elevation resulting in consistently dry land conditions. These would include a parking area

situated on the south side of George Street to provide convenient public access, two areas on the north side of George Street that would need to be backfilled to protect buried utility infrastructure, and within the footprint of the trail system so as to provide year round access.

This PRCP alternative assumes the balance of the site would be restored as a wetland park complex featuring three wetland types:

- **Sub-irrigated wetland** The majority of the area of the park, would be backfilled such that all areas would be within one foot of ground water during the wetter season of the year. As groundwater level fluctuates, for much of the year these areas would be drier than the other wetland types.
- **Depressional wetlands** several areas throughout the park would receive limited backfill, or a shallow over-excavation to provide consistently wetter conditions to provide a diversity of wetland habitat.
- Open water wetlands two ponds totaling 2.2 acres would be excavated to a depth of 20 feet. These would provide open water wetland habitat for waterfowl. In light of input from various entities on the draft PCRP, open water wetlands and ponds likely will not be carried forward in developing the CRP.

These three wetland types could be moved or altered to accommodate storm water or other concerns.

Approximately 25 acres of wetland habitat types would result from this draft PCRP option, a substantial increase over the 3-4 acres of wetlands that are currently present in the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area, and would be much closer to wetland habitat conditions which existed prior to tailings disposal. Connecting these wetland habitats to each other and to the existing greenway trail that runs the length of the MSD would be a 1.5 mile network of walking/biking trails, providing recreational access to the restored parklands. Included in the trail system would be a footbridge over the MSD, which by its depth and inaccessibility would otherwise isolate the south side park area from the larger trail system.

Alternative 1 would maintain the MSD surface drain and the MSD sub-drain in their current configuration and function. Under this alternative, the current East Buffalo storm water ditch would be replaced with a buried culvert that would report to the MSD. All other current storm water delivery to the MSD would be maintained or similarly replaced. The wetland elements of this alternative are all groundwater fed features. As such, there would be no increase in local groundwater level attendant to this option.

Figure 16 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative 1

3.2.2. Alternative 2 End Land Use Considerations

The second draft PCRP alternative for post-tailings removal restoration of the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area is presented on Figure 17. Conceptual cross sections for Alternative 2 for cross sections A, B, and C from Figure 17 are presented on Figures Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14 respectively.

After further evaluation and in light of input from various entities on the draft PCRP, Alternative 2 will likely not be taken forward in the CRP.

Under this alternative, the current MSD surface water conveyance through the Northside Tailings area would be decommissioned, and its flow rerouted into a wider, more sinuous riparian/wetland swale feature south of George Street through the former Diggings East area. The current "steep and deep" MSD surface drainage ditch presents an imposing visual and physical access barrier that bisects the available open space north of George Street, greatly reducing the utility of this space to the community. This reconstructed portion of the MSD would be expected to meet all performance specifications and storm water design flows of the current MSD. Replacing that feature with a wider, shallower swale of equivalent storm water conveyance capacity is expected to result in a much more aesthetically pleasing and physically accessible storm water channel with greatly improved environmental functions and recreational value, while maintaining or enhancing the performance of the MSD as a remedy element. A typical cross section of the riparian/wetland swale feature is provided on Figure 18.

In addition to the riparian/wetland swale, this PCRP option of the Diggings East area south of George Street would include a mix of mostly wetland and some upland habitats accessible from a mile or more of walking/biking trails that would also serve to connect the neighborhood to the east to the existing MSD trail.

Although the riparian/wetland swale would be generally accessible to park users under this alternative, two footbridges would be added to connect the trails on the north and south banks of the swale to provide "dry feet" access during the wet season and ADA compliant access to the entire park year round.

This PCRP alternative assumes the wetland habitats in the southside park would be of four primary types:

 Surface water fed – within the lined riparian swale, there would be no connection to groundwater. Hydrologic support for vegetation would come from direct precipitation and from the storm water carried by the swale. As these would be episodic and vary in quantity, one would expect a gradient from wetland to more upland type vegetation communities to develop within the swale, with wetter types predominating near the pilot channel and more extensively during wetter years.

Figure 17 Diggings East and Northside Tailings Project Area, PCRP Alternative 2

- **Sub-irrigated wetland** The majority of the area of the park outside of the riparian/wetland swale would be backfilled such that all areas would be within one foot of ground water during the wetter season of the year. As groundwater level fluctuates, for much of the year these areas would be drier than the other wetland types.
- Depressional wetland one area in the center of the wetland complex would receive a shallow over-excavation to provide consistently wetter conditions to provide a diversity of wetland habitat. This groundwater connected wetland would also receive runoff from the now clean upland parkland north of George Street via a culvert. Only direct precipitation to the upland park would report to this wetland – all offsite storm water would continue to report to the riparian/wetland swale for conveyance off the site.

As the direct precipitation to the Northside Tailings area currently infiltrates to groundwater via extensive wetlands in that area, and given that this groundwater connected wetland would be further removed from the MSD sub-drain than those existing wetlands currently are, it is not anticipated that recharge from this wetland would increase loading to the MSD sub-drain under this alternative. However, if more detailed analysis indicates a potential loading to the MSD sub-drain is likely, the recharge function of this groundwater connected wetland could be removed by rerouting the surface drainage from the upland park directly to the riparian/wetland swale for conveyance offsite.

 Open water wetlands – two ponds totaling 2.2 acres would be excavated to a depth of 20 feet. These would provide open water wetland habitat for waterfowl. In light of input from various entities on the draft PCRP, open water wetlands and ponds likely will not be carried forward in developing the CRP.

This PCRP assumes that a primary objective of the Restoration Plan – the reduction of contaminant sources to permit the development and beneficial use of the injured area – will be achieved by the contaminated materials removal to be performed in the Diggings East/Northside Tailings area under the PCRP. No component of the PCRP will be implemented that would demonstrably pose a significant increase in the risk to receptors or create a significant adverse impact on the Remedy. North of George Street, the PCRP alternative assumes an unstructured, upland open space that would be contiguous from Kaw Avenue on the southwest to Casey Street on the northeast. Many potential community uses could be accommodated in this space or it could be maintained as an upland open space counterpart to the wetland park south of George Street.

Under this PCRP alternative, the decommissioned portion of the existing MSD surface drain would be filled and regarded to become an integral part of the contiguous parkland north of George Street. The current MSD sub-drain would be left undisturbed to continue its function as a component of the remedy. Maintenance access to the MSD sub-drain would be maintained by extending existing manholes to the new surface elevation.

All current storm water conveyance to the MSD surface drain, including that carried by the existing East Buffalo storm water ditch, would be redirected to the riparian swale, which would be constructed to carry the design flow of the current MSD (i.e., the 25 year, 24 hour storm event as defined by a Type II rainfall distribution – approximately 450 cfs at Kaw Avenue), with a channel configuration intended to also transport the anticipated stormwater sediment load. The riparian swale would be lined over its full width and length to match the permeability performance of the existing MSD surface drain to prevent communication with groundwater and water loading to the MSD sub-drain. Removing the MSD from its current position atop the MSD-sub-drain to a location 300-700 feet distant, increasing the lined area of the MSD, and increasing evapotranspiration across the site via open water and greatly expanded wetland area would all be expected to further reduce loading to the MSD sub-drain, improving the performance of this remedy component.

Within the context of this alternative, future incorporation of sedimentation/ surface water detention basins could be achieved:

- at the location of the proposed ponds south of George street. Lined wetland basins instead of groundwater ponds could be constructed. Line basins would necessarily be shallower than the proposed ponds, but might be deepened by raising overall fill level of the site or by berming the basins;
- within the proposed swale, above George Street. This would require water control structures and additional road protection, and may benefit from widening for additional capacity;
- by reconfiguring the proposed upland park north of George Street to include a lined basin (fed by rerouting the city storm water line through the basin to a lower connection with MSD and/or overflow from swale). This location would offer the greatest capacity; and / or
- below the terminus of the swale, on the ARCO property to the northeast of the corner of George St. and Kaw avenue.

CONFLUENCE consulting incorporated DRAFT PRELIMINARY CONCEPTUAL RESTORATION PLAN DIGGIN'S EAST AND NORTH SIDE TAILINGS RIPARIAN/WETLAND SWALE CROSS SECTION

Materials Subject to FRE 408

3.2.3. Resultant Restoration and End Land Use Costs

Diggings East Alternative 1 - Cost Estimate for Diggings East Restoration (Construction of Wetland Complex without Relocating Storm Drain)

The cost estimate for this PCRP alternative at Diggings East includes the construction of a wetland complex while maintaining the Metro Storm Drain in its current location. The primary expenses include: excavation of ponds, placement of fill around the perimeter of the site, and the importing of topsoil throughout the site. The total cost estimate for this PCRP option is about \$3.1 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
DIGGINS EAST RESTORATION				
Site Excavation	18,337	CY	\$4.20	\$77,087
Pond 1 Excavation	9,035	CY	\$4.20	\$37,982
Pond 2 Excavation	26,908	CY	\$4.20	\$113,119
Import and Place Topsoil	33,835	CY	\$33.70	\$1,140,099
Place Fill (On Site Source)	49,155	CY	\$12.29	\$604,123
Construct Parking Lot	50	CARS	\$1,407.90	\$70,395
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	4,818	LF	\$5.77	\$27,805
Install New Water Main (8" PVC)	600	LF	\$34.98	\$20,985
Dewatering	1	LS	\$91,792.00	\$91,792
Revegetation	21	ACRES	\$2,279.12	\$47,798
Erosion Control	1	EA	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
Sub Total				\$2,236,185
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$2,236,185	\$55,905
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$2,236,185	\$20,126
Insurance	0.09%		\$2,236,185	\$1,901
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$2,236,185	\$4,472
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$2,236,185	\$335,428
Sub Total				\$417,831
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$2,654,017
Contingency @15%				\$398,102
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$3,052,119

 Table 4 Diggings East Restoration Cost, Alternative 1

Northside Tailings Alternative 1 - Cost Estimate for Northside Tailings Restoration (Construction of wetlands in Tailings Removal Area)

The cost estimate for this restoration alternative at Northside Tailings includes the construction of shallow wetland habitat within the tailings excavation at the site. The site was conceptually designed to balance cut/fill, not requiring importing of fill material. The southwest and northwest corners of the site will be filled to provide cover for sewer and storm sewer pipelines. The primary costs for this restoration option are; cut and placing fill in the northeast and southwest corners of the site, and the construction of a bridge across the Metro Storm Drain to provide access to the site. The total cost estimate for this restoration option is about \$0.5 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
NORTHSIDE TAILINGS RESTORATION				
Strip Topsoil and Stockpile	1,271	CY	\$0.86	\$1,093
Install Drain Pipes (3 - 24" HDPE)	440	LF	\$75.58	\$33,256
Install Drain Pipe Across George St. (1 - 24" HDPE)	450	LF	\$25.19	\$11,337
Install New Water Main (8" PVC)	400	LF	\$34.98	\$13,990
Cut and Place Fill (sloped Banks)	1,012	CY	\$4.67	\$4,731
Cut and Place Fill (southwest and northeast corners)	9,815	CY	\$10.72	\$105,219
Place (Topsoil)	11,670	CY	\$0.86	\$10,036
Dewatering	1	LS	\$13,520.00	\$13,520
Construct Pedestrian Bridge / Walkway	1	EA	\$112,157.76	\$112,158
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	2,050	LF	\$5.77	\$11,831
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000
Revegetate	7	ACRE	\$3,254.20	\$23,540
Sub Total				\$343,710
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$343,710	\$8,593
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$343,710	\$3,093
Insurance	0.09%		\$343,710	\$292
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$343,710	\$687
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$343,710	\$51,557
Sub Total				\$64,222
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$407,933
Contingency @15%				\$61,190
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$469,123

 Table 5 Northside Tailings Restoration Cost, Alternative 1

Combining the estimated removal and resultant restoration costs for both Diggings East and Northside Tailings, the total project cost for Alternative 1 would be approximately \$11 million. As detailed in Section 3.1.1, concurrent restoration with Alternative 1 or 2 from the Blacktail Berm Restoration as presented in this PCRP may allow balancing of cut and fill between the projects, resulting in substantial cost savings to both.

Diggings East Alternative 2 - Cost Estimate for Diggings East Restoration (Construction of a Wetland Complex and Relocating Storm Drain)

The cost estimate for this restoration alternative at Diggings East includes the construction of a wetland complex and the relocation of the Metro Storm Drain through the site. The primary expenses for the restoration of the site include; the construction of the relocated Metro Storm Drain, placement of fill from on-site excavation, and the importing of topsoil throughout the site. The total cost estimate for this restoration option is about \$5.0 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
DIGGINS EAST RESTORATION				
Spread Topsoil (On Site Source)	11,572	CY	\$0.86	\$9,952
Import and Place Topsoil	37,438	CY	\$33.70	\$1,261,526
Place Fill (On Site Source)	59,600	CY	\$12.29	\$732,496
Site Excavation	32,959	CY	\$4.20	\$138,557
Floodplain Excavation North of George St.	12,040	CY	\$4.20	\$50,615
Pond 1 Excavation	9,035	CY	\$4.20	\$37,982
Pond 2 Excavation	26,908	CY	\$4.20	\$113,119
Construct Storm Drain \ Riparian Swale	3,830	LF	\$143.03	\$547,792
Install Linstream Culvert CrossingsAcross George St. (2 - 88" x 54" Concrete Culverts)	270	IF	\$500.09	\$135.023
Install Downstream Culvert Crossing Across George St. (2 - 88" x 54" Concrete Culverts)	190	LE	\$506.81	\$96 294
Construct Parking Lot	50	CARS	\$1 407 90	\$70 395
Construct Pedestrian Bridge / Walkway	2	FA	\$112,157,76	\$224,316
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	6.137	LF	\$5.77	\$35.417
Install New Water Main (8" PVC)	645	LF	\$34.98	\$22,559
Install Risers for Sub-Drain	1	EA	\$2,000.00	\$2,000
Dewatering	1	LS	\$91,792.00	\$91,792
Revegetation	30	ACRES	\$2,279.12	\$69,236
Erosion Control	1	EA	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
Sub Total				\$3,644,070
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$3,644,070	\$91,102
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$3,644,070	\$32,797
Insurance	0.09%		\$3,644,070	\$3,097
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$3,644,070	\$7,288
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$3,644,070	\$546,611
Sub Total				\$680,895
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$4,324,965
Contingency @15%				\$648,745
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$4,973,709

 Table 6 Diggings East Restoration Cost, Alternative 2

Northside Tailings Alternative 2 - Cost Estimate for Northside Tailings Restoration (Restore Site to an Upland Field)

The cost estimation for this restoration alternative at Northside Tailings includes the construction of an upland site to be utilized for future needs of the city. The primary expense of this restoration option is importing of fill material needed to provide a finished grade surface suitable for future use. The total cost estimate for this restoration option is about \$1.3 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
NORTHSIDE TAILINGS RESTORATION				
Strip Topsoil and Stockpile	11,560	CY	\$0.86	\$9,942
Import and Place Fill	37,931	CY	\$22.15	\$840,255
Install Drain Pipes (3 - 24" HDPE)	440	LF	\$75.58	\$33,256
Install Drain Pipe Across George St. (1 - 24" HDPE)	450	LF	\$25.19	\$11,337
Install New Water Main (8" PVC)	400	LF	\$34.98	\$13,990
Place (Topsoil)	21,960	CY	\$0.86	\$18,886
Dewatering	1	LS	\$13,520.00	\$13,520
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000
Revegetate	14	ACRE	\$1,540.00	\$21,355
Sub Total				\$965,542
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$965,542	\$24,139
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$965,542	\$8,690
Insurance	0.09%		\$965,542	\$821
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$965,542	\$1,931
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$965,542	\$144,831
Sub Total				\$180,411
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$1,145,953
Contingency @15%				\$171,893
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$1,317,846

 Table 7 Northside Tailings Restoration Cost, Alternative 2

Combining the estimated removal and resultant restoration costs for both Diggings East and Northside Tailings, the total project cost for Diggings East and Northside Tailings Alternative 2 would be approximately \$13.8 million. As with Alternative 1, concurrent restoration with Alternative 1 or 2 from the Blacktail Berm Restoration as presented in this PCRP may allow balancing of cut and fill between the projects, resulting in substantial cost savings to both.

4. BLACKTAIL BERM PROJECT

4.1. Tailings/Contaminated Materials Removal

4.1.1. Removal Actions

Data characterizing tailings/contaminated materials in the vicinity of the Blacktail berm are limited. Five locations, all within the 1.2 acre footprint of the berm, were sampled for the report *Final Draft Version Tailings/Impacted Sediment Delineation of the Diggings East, Blacktail Berm, and Northside Tailings Areas* (MBMG 2014). Boring locations and identifiers are presented in Figure 19. Surface ownership within the Diggings East and Northside Tailings project footprint and surrounding areas, from Montana Cadastral, is presented on Figure 20.

All boring results documented one or more layers within or beneath the berm that failed the concentration-based criterion for removal of contaminated materials established for the Diggings East and Northside Tailings areas (see Section 3.1.1). As in the other BAO tailings areas, the highest concentration of COCs was often found in an organic silt layer at a depth of 8-12 feet below the current ground surface that underlies visually identified tailings and overlies clean material beneath. Therefore the removal scenario assumption for the Blacktail berm in the PCRP is removal of the footprint of the berm to the base of that organic silt layer (average 10 feet BGS).

A second Blacktail berm option includes addressing the additional tailings and other contaminated materials in the 9.3 acres of wetland behind the berm. These materials are saturated and are potentially affecting the quality of groundwater and surface water in Blacktail Creek. In addition, erosion or a failure of the berm could release these sediments to Blacktail Creek directly, imperiling Silver Bow Creek. This option would remove these materials as well, using the same removal criterion as applied to the other BAO units: removal to the bottom of the original organic silt/clay soil horizon (approximately 10 feet BGS).

4.1.2. Transport and Disposal Options

As discussed in Section 2.1.2 for the Parrot Tailings project area, two transport methods, truck haul and slurry pipeline, could be used to remove the tailings and contaminated materials from the Diggings East and Northside Tailings project areas to a permanent repository, but for this PCRP, only the truck haul option to a nearby repository location is evaluated.

Repository location and transport method will be addressed in the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan. NRDP will continue its work with all interested entities in the development of the draft Conceptual Restoration Plan.

Figure 19 Blacktail Berm Project Area, Borehole Locations

Figure 20 Blacktail Berm Project Area, Property Ownership

4.1.3. Estimated Removal Costs

Scenario A - Cost Estimate for Tailings and Contaminated Materials Removal at Blacktail Berm Site (9.3 Acre Site Wide Removal to Bottom of Black Silt Layer (10') and Hauling to a Repository)

This option includes the removal of tailings and contaminated materials from the Blacktail berm site. The extent of the removal includes all wetlands within the site and removal to the depth of the black silt layer, approximately 10 feet below existing grade. The tailings will be removed with excavators and hauled to a repository with on-road haul trucks. The tailings will be capped and revegetated. The total cost estimate for this removal option is approximately \$2.9 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
TAILINGS REMOVAL - BLACKTAIL BERM COMPLEX (Haul to Repository)				
Tailings + Organic Clays Dig and Haul	138,636	CY	\$9.72	\$1,346,977
Strip Topsoil at Repository	6,938	CY	\$0.86	\$5,950
Spread Tailings in Repository	138,636	CY	\$3.95	\$547,566
Spread Topsoil at Repository	6,938	CY	\$0.86	\$5,950
Revegetate Repsitory	4.30	Acre	\$1,540.00	\$6,623
Cap Tailings	4.30	Acre	\$30,000.00	\$129,014
Dewatering Site	1	LS	\$61,533.75	\$61,534
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
TAILINGS REMOVAL SUBTOTAL				\$2,108,614
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$2,108,614	\$52,715
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$2,108,614	\$18,978
Insurance	0.85%		\$2,108,614	\$17,923
Testing/Environmental	2.00%		\$2,108,614	\$42,172
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$2,108,614	\$316,292
Sub Total				\$448,080
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$2,556,694
Contingency @15%				\$383,504
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$2,940,198

Table 8 Blacktail Berm Removal Cost, Scenario A

Scenario B - Cost Estimate for Tailings and Contaminated Materials Removal at Blacktail Berm Site (Removal of Berm Only to Bottom of Black Silt Layer (10') and Hauling to a Repository)

This option includes the removal of tailings and organic clays from the Blacktail berm site. The extent of the removal area includes the Blacktail berm adjacent to Blacktail Creek and removal to the depth of the black silt layer, approximately 10 feet below existing grade. The tailings and contaminated materials will be removed with excavators and hauled to a repository with on-road haul trucks. The tailings will be capped and revegetated. The total cost estimate for this removal option is approximately \$0.7 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
TAILINGS REMOVAL - BLACKTAIL BERM COMPLEX (Haul to Repository)				
Tailings + Organic Clays Dig and Haul	34,908	CY	\$9.72	\$339,162
Strip Topsoil at Repository	1,747	CY	\$0.86	\$1,498
Spread Tailings in Repository	34,908	CY	\$3.95	\$137,874
Spread Topsoil at Repository	1,747	CY	\$0.86	\$1,498
Revegetate Repsitory	1.08	Acre	\$1,540.00	\$1,668
Cap Tailings	1.08	Acre	\$30,000.00	\$32,485
Dewatering Site	1	LS	\$12,459.75	\$12,460
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$2,500.00	\$2,500
TAILINGS REMOVAL SUBTOTAL				\$529,146
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$529,146	\$13,229
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$529,146	\$4,762
Insurance	0.85%		\$529,146	\$4,498
Testing/Environmental	2.00%		\$529,146	\$10,583
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$529,146	\$79,372
Sub Total				\$112,443
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$641,589
Contingency @15%				\$96,238
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$737.828

 Table 9 Blacktail Berm Removal Cost, Scenario B

4.2. Resultant Restoration and End Land Uses

Three PCRP alternatives are assumed for the Blacktail Berm area:

4.2.1. Alternative 1 End Land Use Considerations

Alternative 1 is the "stream only" alternative. It would begin from the postexcavation surface of a site wide, bottom of silt/clay removal scenario (removal Scenario A). The site would then be restored with a relocated Blacktail Creek channel and floodplain constructed from clean fill. A walking/bike trail that connects to the existing MSD/greenway trail to the existing park trail network via a footbridge would provide recreation access to the site. The reconstructed stream is expected to provide increased stream length and habitat complexity to Blacktail Creek, and may offer some groundwater loading reduction to the MSD sub-drain. The finished grade of the Blacktail Creek floodplain could be kept low to encourage wetland development, or raised to provide drier parkland. The stream, trail and parkland elements of this PCRP alternative are presented on Figure 21. A conceptual cross section of this alternative through section A from Figure 21 is presented on Figure 22.

4.2.2. Alternative 2 End Land Use Considerations

The Skyline Sportsman's Association and other members of the community have expressed a desire to have a kids' fishing pond at the Blacktail Berm location. This Alternative 2 would expand on the "stream only" aspect of Alternative 1, and include a 2.3 acre, 20 foot deep pond along with the stream channel relocation, reconstructed Blacktail Creek floodplain, and recreation trail elements. The proposed pond configuration is presented on Figure 23. A conceptual cross section of this PCRP alternative through section A from Figure 23 is presented on Figure 22.

4.2.3. Alternative 3 End Land Use Considerations

Alternative 3 (Figure 24) represents the minimum, isolated response to the problem of a Blacktail Berm constructed from tailings and other contaminated materials threatening the water quality of Blacktail Creek. As shown on Figure 25, this minimum, isolated response removes the existing berm, removes the contaminated material beneath the berm down to the base of the historic soil horizon (approx. 10' depth), then backfills the excavation and reconstructs the berm using clean fill material.

The minimum response leaves behind substantial quantities of the same contaminated material from which the berm was constructed, in the adjacent wetland. It relies on the berm to protect Blacktail Creek in perpetuity, and leaves contaminated material in contact with surface water and groundwater. The minimum response foregoes opportunities to improve Blacktail Creek alignment and habitat, and to create additional recreational uses for this site.

The approximate footprint of the current Blacktail Berm that would be reconstructed under this alternative is presented on Figure 19. A conceptual cross section of this alternative through section A from Figure 21 is presented on Figure 25.

Figure 21 Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 1

Figure 22 Blacktail Berm Restoration Conceptual Cross Sections, Alternatives 1 and 2.

Figure 23 Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 2

Figure 24 Blacktail Berm PCRP Alternative 3

Figure 25 Blacktail Berm Restoration Conceptual Cross Sections, Alternative 3

4.2.4. Resultant Restoration and End Land Use Costs

Alternative 1 - Backfill from Bottom of Contaminated Materials Excavation, Relocate Blacktail Creek Channel, add Recreation Elements

The cost estimation for this PCRP alternative at the Blacktail Berm site includes constructing a new channel to reroute Blacktail Creek through the south side of the site. This option would require filling the site from an excavation of depth of approximately 10' to a suitable elevation to prevent a perched channel. The primary expense for this PCRP option is importing fill and topsoil to bring the site up to grade. The cost estimate for this alternative is about \$3.9 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
BLACKTAIL BERM RESTORATION RESTORATION				
Import and Place Topsoil	13,597	CY	\$33.70	\$458,166
Import and Place Fill	93,071	CY	\$22.15	\$2,061,732
Construct Pedestrian Bridge / Walkway	1	EA	\$56,600.00	\$56,600
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	1,084	LF	\$5.77	\$6,256
Construct Channel	1,820	LF	\$130.74	\$237,944
Dewatering	1	LS	\$20,511.25	\$20,511
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
Revegetation	8.4	ACRES	\$4,183.52	\$35,259
Sub Total				\$2,881.468
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				. ,,
Mobilization	2.50%		\$2,881,468	\$72,037
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$2,881,468	\$25,933
Insurance	0.09%		\$2,881,468	\$2,449
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$2,881,468	\$5,763
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$2,881,468	\$432,220
Sub Total				\$538,402
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$3,419,870
Contingency @15%				\$512,980
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$3,932,850

 Table 10 Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 1

Taken together with the removal cost (Table 8) the total estimated project cost for Alternative 1 would be approximately \$6.8 million. As the largest single cost item is the importation and placement of backfill to restore the site to grade, concurrent restoration of the Diggings East and Northside Tailings area (which produce excess material) could result in substantial cost savings to both projects.

Alternative 2 - Backfill from Bottom of Contaminated Silt Excavation, Relocate Blacktail Creek Channel, Excavate Pond, add Recreation Elements

The cost estimation for this PCRP alternative at the Blacktail Berm site includes constructing a new channel to reroute Blacktail Creek through the south side of the site as well as a pond. This option would require filling the site from an excavation of depth of approximately 10' to a suitable elevation to prevent a perched channel. The primary expense for this option is the importing of fill and topsoil to bring the site up to grade, as well as the construction of a pond. The total cost estimate for this option is about \$3.2 million. The lower cost than Alternative 1 reflects the lessor amount of backfill required due to the presence of the pond.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
BLACKTAIL BERM RESTORATION RESTORATION				
Import and Place Topsoil	9,601	CY	\$33.70	\$323,516
Import and Place Fill	67,928	CY	\$22.15	\$1,504,764
Construct Pedestrian Bridge / Walkway	1	EA	\$56,600.00	\$56,600
Construct Trails (6' Wide Gravel)	1,084	LF	\$5.77	\$6,256
Excavate Pond #1	29,139	CY	\$4.20	\$122,497
Construct Channel	1,820	LF	\$130.74	\$237,944
Dewatering	1	LS	\$69,035.25	\$69,035
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$5,000.00	\$5,000
Revegetation	6.0	ACRES	\$5,698.35	\$33,911
Sub Total				\$2,359,523
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$2,359,523	\$58,988
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$2,359,523	\$21,236
Insurance	0.09%		\$2,359,523	\$2,006
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$2,359,523	\$4,719
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$2,359,523	\$353,928
Sub Total				\$440,877
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$2,800,400
Contingency @15%				\$420,060
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$3 220 460
				<i>ş</i> 3,220,400

 Table 11 Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 2

Taken together with the removal cost (Table 8) the total estimated project cost for Alternative 1 would be approximately \$6.1 million. As with Alternative 1, the largest single cost item is the importation and placement of backfill to restore the site to grade. The same substantial cost savings attendant to the concurrent restoration of the Blacktail Berm, Diggings East and Northside Tailings area (which produce excess material) would apply to Alternative 2.

Alternative 3 - Backfill and Reconstruct the Blacktail Creek Berm from Berm Only Removal Excavation

The cost estimation for this PCRP alternative at the Blacktail Berm site includes the placement of clean fill to restore the site to the original grade following a removal of the current Blacktail Berm to a depth of approximately 10 feet below ground surface. The primary expense for this option is the importing of fill and topsoil to restore the site from an excavation depth of approximately 10' to final grade. The total cost estimate for this alternative is about \$1.1 million.

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL PRICE
BLACKTAIL BERM RESTORATION RESTORATION				
Import and Place Topsoil	2,944	CY	\$33.70	\$99,201
Import and Place Fill	31,964	CY	\$22.15	\$708,065
Dewatering	1	LS	\$4,153.25	\$4,153
Erosion Control	1	LS	\$2,500.00	\$2,500
Revegetation	1.8	ACRES	\$9,610.61	\$17,540
Sub Total	1			\$831,459
PROJECT STARTUP/ENVIRONMENTAL				
Mobilization	2.50%		\$831,459	\$20,786
Performance Bond	0.90%		\$831,459	\$7,483
Insurance	0.09%		\$831,459	\$707
Testing/Environmental	0.20%		\$831,459	\$1,663
Design/Engineer Fees 15%	15.00%		\$831,459	\$124,719
Sub Total	1			\$155,358
TOTALDESIGN/CONSTRUCTION				\$986,817
Contingency @15%				\$148,023
TOTAL PROJECT COST				\$1,134,840

 Table 12 Blacktail Creek Restoration Project costs, Alternative 3

Taken together with the associated berm removal cost (Table 9) the total estimated project cost for Alternative 3 would be approximately \$1.8 million.

Unlike Alternatives 1 and 2, Alternative 3 does not offer any capacity to accept the excess of landfill material necessarily created by the Diggings East and Northside Tailings restoration alternatives, eliminating the opportunity to offset any of the approximately \$2.2 million landfill material disposal cost incurred by that project.

Site	Removal	Restoration	Total	
	(million)	(million)	(million)	
Parrot Tailings	\$10.8	\$12.5 ¹	\$23.3	
Northside Diggings				
Alternative 1	\$0.0 ²	\$0.5	\$0.5	
Alternative 2	\$0.0 ²	\$1.3	\$1.3	
Diggings East				
Alternative 1	\$7.6	\$3.1	\$10.7	
Alternative 2	\$7.6	\$5.0	\$12.6	
Blacktail Berm				
Scenario A				
Alternative 1	\$2.9	\$3.9	\$6.8	
Alternative 2	\$2.9	\$3.2	\$6.1	
Scenario B				
Alternative 3	\$0.7	\$1.1	\$1.8	
Subtotals =	\$19.1 to \$21.3	\$17.2 to \$22.7		
		Total =	\$36.3 to \$44.0M	
 1 - Restoration estimate includes approximately \$7.4M to relocate and reconstruct BSB shops 2 - Northside Diggings removal costs included in Diggings East removal cost estimate 				

SUMMARY COST ESTIMATES OF PCRP ALTERNATIVES

 Table 13 Summary Cost Estimates of PCRP Alternatives

5. SUMMARY OF DATA AND ANALYSIS NEEDS

Progressing beyond the PCRP to a draft Conceptual Restoration Plan and ultimately a Final Design and Bid Package to perform the work would require some additional data and analyses to inform those designs.

5.1.1. BAO Sitewide

A hydrogeologic analysis potentially could be performed to quantify any potential effects of these removal actions on groundwater flow volumes to the Metro Subdrain. All indications are that the combination of activities outlined in this PCRP will reduce the amount of water reporting to the MSD Sub-drain and that the water quality will be much improved. Additional data collection and analysis could help confirm this.

The adequacy of the current monitoring network versus O&M needs should be assessed to determine if additional monitoring locations (principally monitoring wells) are needed, and to determine what monitoring infrastructure currently within the proposed project areas would need to be maintained or replaced during implementation.

Concomitant to the assessment of the groundwater monitoring network should be an assessment of the specific construction baseline and ongoing monitoring activities necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the removal and restoration actions. This restoration effectiveness assessment could be compared to the remedy effectiveness to determine potential impacts on ground and surface water elevations and flow characteristics, vegetation success, etc.

Concern that proposed restoration would increase the quantity of water delivered to the MSD sub-drain could be addressed by a hydrologic analysis to determine the probable increase or decrease in flow to the MSD sub-drain expected from restoration elements.

At all sites, the near surface aquifer should be characterized (groundwater elevation, permeability, etc.) to quantify construction dewatering needs.

5.1.2. Parrot Tailings

Additional borings and/or rehabilitation of existing lithology data should be conducted to refine the characterization of tailings and other contaminated materials to better define the removal area and depths. Of particular interest would be the margins of the proposed removal area to the west and southeast, and the "finger" of apparently tailings free material in the vicinity of the ball field. Vertically, some additional borings should be completed to confirm the operating assumption that the black silt/clay material beneath areas without tailings need not be removed.

5.1.3. Diggings East and Northside Tailings

Additional borings should be completed to refine the characterization of tailings and other contaminated materials to better define removal area and depths. Of particular interest would be the area beneath George Street and the outer margins of the two proposed removal areas. Vertically, sufficient data to assess the extent of alluvial impacts and their potential effects on post restoration groundwater quality (especially in the proposed ponds) should be collected.

An analysis of expected post-restoration water quality in near surface or exposed groundwater could be performed to confirm the appropriateness of restoration elements such as groundwater contact wetlands and groundwater ponds.

5.1.4. Blacktail Berm

Additional borings should be completed to refine the characterization of tailings and other contaminated materials to better define removal area and depths. Of particular interest would be the wetland area behind the current Blacktail Berm, extending south to I-90 and east to Lexington Avenue. Vertically, sufficient data to assess the extent of alluvial impacts and their potential effects on post restoration groundwater quality (especially in the proposed pond) should be collected.

An analysis of expected post-restoration water quality in exposed groundwater could be performed to confirm the appropriateness the proposed pond and to determine the depth of material removal required to provide adequate water quality to support it.

6. **REFERENCES**

- Butte Natural Resource Damage Restoration Council and Montana Natural Resource Damage Program, 2012. Butte Area One Final Restoration Plan.
- Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, 2010, Open File Report No. 590 The Parrot Complex: a Drilling Investigation of Historic Mine Waste Left in Place; Tailings and Overburden Volumes, Leachability and Economic Feasibility for Recovery, and Water Quality Along the Upper Metro Storm Drain in Butte, Montana.

Montana Cadastral, 2014.

- Montana Natural Resource Damage Program, 2007. Butte Area One Draft Conceptual Restoration Plan.
- Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology, 2014, Final Draft Version Tailings/Impacted Sediment Delineation of the Diggings East, Blacktail Creek Berm, and Northside Tailings Areas.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004, Final Focused Feasibility Study for the Metro Storm Drain, Butte Priority Soils Operable Unit.