

Appendices

O - Q



Appendix O Swift Fox Survey Protocol

The following protocol is a modification of a swift fox protocol included in Mineral Exploration Permit Number NE0210824 (dated August 19, 2009) issued by the Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ) to Crow Butte Resources, Inc (NDEQ 2009). This permit primarily addresses impacts associated with drilling of boreholes for purposes of mineral exploration. The primary modification of the Appendix 10 protocol is expanding the type of activities potentially impacting the swift fox to include, in addition to drilling of boreholes, uranium in situ satellite project development activities. Satellite “project development” includes construction of satellite facilities (process building and associated storage structures, evaporation ponds, wellfield development (surface preparation, monitor and injection/recovery wells, wellhouses, and trunklines/piping), well workover, boreholes outside of wellfields, and project roadways. Reference to “project development” in this protocol refers to these activities. Project development activities apply to initial construction/wellfield development, operations and decommissioning. Decommissioning includes decontaminating, dismantling, and removing satellite facilities and associated wellfield buildings/equipment/wells and, site reclamation and groundwater restoration.

Swift fox are typically found in topographically flat (slopes <20%) arid regions. In Nebraska, suitable habitat is in the short-grass prairie ecoregion where vegetation is less than 40 cm tall. They can be found in large expanses of prairie as well as prairie intermixed with agriculture. Dens are also found in anthropogenic areas such as near roads and trails, and in agricultural fields, culverts pipes and buildings (Tannerfeldt et al 2003). Swift fox are highly mobile and will use a variety of dens throughout the year. However, a female swift fox with young pups will typically be tied to one den until the pups are old enough to disperse from the den. Swift fox den entrances have a diameter of 17 to 23 cm.

Required Surveys:

CBR will avoid impacting the swift fox species by avoiding certain locations during specific times of the year. Surveys shall be conducted that are consistent with the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (NG&PC) standard protocol included in CBR’s Mineral Exploration Permit Number NE0210824 as Attachment 1.

The survey form to be used for swift fox surveys is attached to this protocol.

Project development activities will occur within a designated permit boundary. If project development activities within this permit boundary are such that specific protocol requirements (e.g., designated distances from swift fox dens) cannot be avoided as stated in this protocol, CBR will consult with the NDEQ and NG&PC as to the feasibility of

CROW BUTTE RESOURCES, INC.

Swift Fox Survey Protocol Marsland Expansion Area



alternate actions. No work will be conducted until any such issue has been resolved with the NDEQ and NG&PC.

Surveyors:

Surveys shall be conducted by a qualified individual who has experience working with the species or has been trained to identify swift fox burrows, dens and sign (scat, tracks, etc.).

Location:

Surveys shall be conducted at project development sites discussed above where suitable habitat is present within the range of the species.

Season:

Surveys shall be conducted year-around in areas of suitable habitat where project development activities are planned.

Timing:

Surveys shall be conducted within one week of initiating project development activities described above under Location.

Survey Technique:

The “denning season” is defined as the period of time when adult swift fox give birth and raise pups. In Nebraska, the swift fox denning season is from April 1 through August 31.

During the denning season, the area that must be surveyed for dens includes project development activities plus an additional 230 meters around the affected areas. When developing wellfields, numerous boreholes will initially be drilled. In this situation, the “affected area” will be the perimeter of the wellfield for the addition of 230 meters to the survey area, as opposed to each drill site. Under such conditions (i.e. work over multiple days or months), only one survey shall be submitted for that period indicating the duration of planned activities in the survey area. During other periods of time (e.g., operations), when individual boreholes are drilled at one time or a workover rig is used for well maintenance, then the additional 230 meters will be applied to the drill site. The above procedures will allow the operator the option of the most effective type of survey to use - wellfield boundary or individual drill site. The satellite facilities will be located within a 1.8-acre fenced-in site. The swift fox survey will be conducted prior to construction using an additional 230 meters around the fence boundary.

During the non-denning season (September 1 through March 31), the area that must be surveyed for dens includes the project development activities plus an additional 100 meters around the affected areas. When developing wellfields, numerous boreholes will initially be drilled. In this situation, the “affected area” will be the perimeter of the



wellfield for the addition of 100 meters to the survey area, as opposed to each drill site. Under such conditions (i.e. work over multiple days or months), only one survey shall be submitted for that period indicating the duration of planned activities in the survey area. During other periods of time (e.g., operations), when individual boreholes are drilled at one time or a workover rig is used for well maintenance, then the additional 100 meters will be applied to the drill site. The above procedures will allow the operator the option of the most effective type of survey to use - wellfield boundary or individual drill site. The satellite facilities will be located within a 1.8-acre fenced-in site. The swift fox survey will be conducted using an additional 100 meters around the fence boundary.

The survey will consist of walking transects and searching for dens within the survey area. Transects will be no more than 50 meters apart in order to thoroughly cover the area.

An active den may have fresh digging at the entrance, although this is not always the case (Jackson and Choate 2000). Sign, such as scat or tracks, can also indicate an active den. Swift fox tracks are approximately 2.54 cm wide and 3.8 cm long. Although this is the smallest canid species, tracks can be confused with other species, especially young coyotes. Inactive dens may be overgrown with vegetation, have spider webs over the entrance, or be caving in.

Conservative Measures:

If a potentially active swift fox den is identified, one of two conservation measures should be implemented:

1. The area of project development activities shall be done so activities are at least 230 meters from the den during the denning season, or 100 meters from the den during the non-denning season. For drilling sites, these can be moved to an appropriate distance from the den. A survey around any of these new activities must be conducted.
2. A track or scent station can be set up to determine if the den is being used by swift fox. If track or scent stations indicate swift fox are using the den, then project development activities within a minimum of 100 meters or 230 meters (whichever is appropriate for the season) of the den would be postponed until the den is abandoned. For drilling sites, they can be moved as outlined in #1 above. If track or scent stations indicate swift fox are not using the den, then drilling activities may proceed if there are not any other dens or swift fox within the survey area.

Track Station: Den use can be determined by clearing vegetation around the den and sifting a mixture of fine dry sand and unscented glycerin in a circular pattern (~1 m in diameter) around the den hole, approximately 0.5 inches thick. Tracks of the animal using the den can then be identified the following morning as most animals using underground dens are nocturnal and will exit the den at night. Track stations are only



good for one night. If the track station cannot be checked the following morning, a new sand and glycerin mixture should be applied to the area around the den hole and surveyed the next morning.

Scent Station: Swift fox scent station surveys can be conducted any time of the year, although tracks will not show on bare, frozen ground. However, snow can be used as a tracking medium in winter. Scent stations are created by clearing any vegetation in an area and sifting a mixture of fine dry sand and unscented glycerin in a circular pattern (~1 m in diameter) approximately 0.5 inches thick. A plaster tablet soaked in cod/salmon oil mixture (or either) is placed in the center of the station. Scent stations are then placed at locations selected based on the suitability of the surrounding habitat and the presence of certain structures (fence rows, gates, intersections, trails, etc.) that facilitate movement. Weather permitting, they are reset for 3 consecutive days or until at least one station shows sign of swift fox visitation (tracks, feces). Scent stations should not be used within 300 meters of a known or suspected active den as these methods may attract predators.

Survey Reports

A monthly survey report shall be submitted to Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (NG&PC) and Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ) describing all surveys for the swift fox that were conducted during the previous month in connection with project development activities. The survey report shall include the names of the surveyors and their credentials, date and time of the survey, weather conditions, locations surveyed, methods, results, and a discussion of applicable conservation measures implemented. If the swift fox is not identified, the above information must be recorded and included in the report to be submitted at the end of the month. If a swift fox is identified within the survey area, NG&PC must be notified by telephone within twenty-four (24) hours of identification. Written documentation of identification and the survey report shall be submitted with five (5) days of species identification, along with indication of conservation measures. All survey reports shall be submitted no later than the 28th day of the month following the end of the reporting period, even if the species being surveyed are not detected at a particular site. Copies of the reports shall be kept on site for inspection by the NDEQ.

References:

- Jackson, V.I. and J.R. Chaote. 2000. *Dens and den sites of the swift fox, Vulpes velox*. The Southwestern Naturalist 45(2):212:220).
- Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality (NDEQ). 2009. *Mineral Exploration Permit Number NE0210824*. August 19, 2009.
- Tannerfeldt, M., A. Moehrensclager and A. Angerbjorn. 2003. *Den ecology of swift, kit, and arctic foxes. A review. In the Swift Fox: Ecology and conservation of swift foxes in a changing world*, M. Sovada and L. Carbyn editors. Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina.



Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality

Threatened and Endangered Species Survey Report

Surveyor' Name(s) _____

Credentials: (e.g., who certified the surveyor and date of certification or surveyor's knowledge of surveyed species)

Date of Survey: _____ Time of Survey: _____

Weather Condition:

Temperature: _____ °F Wind Speed & Direction: _____

Other



Sunny



Partly Cloudy



Cloudy



Snowing



Raining

Legal Location or GPS coordinates (Lat/Long or UTM) of survey area (include datum, i.e., NAD83, WGS84): _____

County: _____

Vegetative Cover (i.e. corn stubble, plowed field, wetland, short grass prairie 10-20 cm tall)

Methods used to survey affected area (i.e. Mountain Plover Survey Protocol, 5 transects 50 ft apart)

Were any of the following species identified in the area?

Mountain Plover	Yes/No
River Otter	Yes/No
Swift Fox	Yes/No

If so, what conservation measures were taken? (Attach if necessary)

If species is identified, record the location of the species in GPS coordinates. Also indicate locational certainty (i.e. 3 birds were flushed 50 yards NW from this point). Photographs may be sent with survey reports to aid in site description and species identification.

Submit survey reports monthly to:

Nebraska Game & Parks Commission
Attn: Env. Analyst Supervisor
Nebraska Natural Heritage Program
2200 N 33rd Street
Lincoln, NE 68503

Nebraska Dept. of Env. Quality
Attn: Mineral Exploration Program
P.O. Box 98922
Lincoln, NE 68509

**Table P.1-1 Primary Assumptions Serving as the basis for Surety Cost Estimates
Associated with Restoration and Reclamation of One (1) Mine Unit**

Assumptions	Quantity
Total number of production wells	120*
Total number of injection wells	2000*
Total number of shallow monitor wells	4
Total number of perimeter wells	11
Total number of restoration wells	10
Wellfield Area (ft ²)	588,000
Wellfield Area (acres)	13.5
Affected Ore Zone Area (ft ²)	588,000
Average Completed Thickness (ft)	19.6
Porosity	0.29
Affected Volume (ft ³)	11,524,800
Flare Factor	1.2
K gallons per Pore Volume	30,000
Number of Patterns in Unit(s)	120
Estimated Number of Pore Volumes for Restoration	11
Number of Wells per Wellfield	345
Total Number of Wells	345
Average Well Depth (ft) – Deep Wells	1,100
Average Well Depth (ft) – Shallow Depth	400

Revised 6/11/2013

Estimated costs are summarized in Table P.1-2

*Number of wells per wellhouse typically 4 wellhouses per wellfield

Table P.1-2 Marsland Total Restoration and Reclamation Cost Estimate - 2013 Surety Estimate

Task		Cost \$
I.	Groundwater Restoration (Sheets 3 to 6)	\$233,160
II.	Wellfield Reclamation (Sheets 7 to 10)	\$628,175
III.	Commercial Plant Reclamation/Decommissioning (Sheets 11 to 14)	\$757,896
IV.	Miscellaneous Site Reclamation (Sheets 19 to 21)	\$142,493
V.	Deep Disposal Well Reclamation (Sheet 22)	\$67,593
Subtotal Reclamation and Restoration Cost Estimate		\$1,829,317
Contract Administration 10%		\$182,932
Contingency 15%		\$274,398
TOTAL RECLAMATION AND RESTORATION COST ESTIMATE		\$2,286,647

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-3 Marsland Ground Water Restoration -2013 Surety Estimate, Continued

Task	MU1	MU2	MU3	MU4	MU5	MU6	MU7	MU8	MU9	MU10	MU11	Total
8. Other Laboratory Costs												
Radon, urinalysis, etc. =	\$940.73											
Total for Other Laboratory Costs:	\$6,914.37	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Subtotal Monitoring and Sampling Costs per Mine Unit	\$107,880.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Monitoring and Sampling Costs	\$107,880.27	\$0.00										
VI. MIT Costs												
MIT Costs per Well	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53	\$93.53
Restoration period, plus stabilization	19.35	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
Remaining MIT's per 5 year cycle	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	
Number of Wells MIT'd for Life of Mine Unit	345	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal MIT Mine Unit	\$32,267.85	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5-year MIT Costs for Disposal Wells	\$6,425											
Number of DDWs	1											
Number of MITs per DDW	1											
Subtotal MIT DDW Costs	\$6,425											
Total MIT Costs	\$6,425											
VI. Supervisory Labor Cost												
Engineer Support =	\$8,042.77											
HP Technician support =	\$4,553.62											
Active restoration period (months)	7.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Stabilization period (months)	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
1 Engineer support during active restoration	\$59,114.36	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
2 HP Technician support during active restoration	\$33,469.11	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
3 Engineer support during final stabilization									\$96,513.24	\$96,513.24	\$96,513.24	\$289,539.72
4 HP Technician support during final stabilization									\$54,643.44	\$54,643.44	\$54,643.44	\$163,930.32
5 Cost reduction due to concurrent restoration of Mine Units				0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-75,578.34	-75,578.34	-75,578.34	-\$226,735.02
Subtotal Supervisory Labor per Mine Unit	\$92,583.47	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75,578.34	\$75,578.34	\$75,578.34	\$226,735.02
Total Supervisory Labor Costs	\$243,740.15	\$226,735.02										
TOTAL RESTORATION COST PER WELLFIELD	\$553,699.46	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$75,578.34	\$75,578.34	\$75,578.34	\$226,735.02
TOTAL GROUND WATER RESTORATION COSTS	\$233,160.02											

MU = Mine Unit
Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-4 Marsland Wellfield Reclamation - 2013 Surety Estimate, Continued

	MIU1	MIU2	MIU3	MIU4	MIU5	MIU6	MIU7	MIU8	MIU9	MIU10	MIU11	Totals
IV. Surface Reclamation												
A. Removal and disposal of contaminated soil around wells												
Volume of contaminated soil (0.37 yd3 per injection and production well)	118.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	118.40
Disposal of contaminated soil \$250.05 per yd3	\$29,605.92	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,605.92
Equipment (Cat 924G loader at 2 yd3/hr)	\$10,809.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Labor (1 man-hour per 2 Yd3)	\$1,473.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Subtotal removal and disposal of contaminated soil	\$41,888.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$41,888.52
B. Recontour and seeding												
Recontour and seeding (est. \$300/acre)	\$4,050.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Subtotal Recontour and Seeding	\$4,050.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,050.00
Total Surface Reclamation	\$45,938.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$45,938.52
IV. Well Houses												
Total Quantity	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Average Well House Weight (Lbs.) (Includes wellhead covers for each well)	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	9200	
A. Removal												
Dismantlement at 2-man-days per wellhouse (man-days)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Dismantlement Labor Costs	\$1,592.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,592.72
Equipment (Cat 924G at 2 hours per wellhouse) (hrs)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Equipment Costs	\$1,460.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,460.72
Subtotal Well House Dismantlement Costs	\$3,053.44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,053.44
B. Disposal												
Total Disposal Weight (9200 lbs per wellhouse) (Lbs)	36800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Subtotal Disposal Costs	\$1,104.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,104.00
Total Well House Removal and Disposal Costs	\$4,157.44	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,157.44
TOTAL REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL COSTS PER WELLFIELD	\$325,021.13	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$325,021.13
TOTAL WELLFIELD BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL COSTS	\$325,021.13											

MIU = Mine Unit
Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-5 Marsland Well Abandonment - 2013 Surety Estimate

	MU 1	MU2	MU3	MU4	MU5	MU6	MU7	MU8	MU9	MU10	MU11	Total
I. Well Abandonment (Wellfields)												
# of Production Wells	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
# of Injection Wells	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
# of Perimeter Monitoring Wells	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
# of Shallow Monitoring Wells	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Number of Deep Wells	331	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
Total Number of Shallow Wells	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Average Diameter of Casing (inches)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Production, Injection and Perimeter Well Average Depth (ft)	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	1100	900
Shallow Well Average Depth (ft)	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	327
Total Mine Unit Well Depth (ft)	369700	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369700
Well Abandonment Unit Cost (\$/ft. of well)	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	\$0.82	
Subtotal Abandonment Cost per Wellfield	\$303,154.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$303,154.00
II. Downhole Pump Disposal												
Number of Downhole Pumps												0
Pump Disposal Volume(ft ³)												0.5
Total Pump Disposal Volume(yd ³)												0.0
Downhole Pump Disposal Rate (\$/yd ³)												\$221.64
Subtotal Downhole Pump Disposal												\$0.00
Total Wellfield Abandonment Costs	\$303,154.00											

MU1 - Misc Unit
 Revised 6/11/2013

**Table P.1-6 Marsland Satellite Facility Equipment Decommissioning -
2013 Surety Estimate**

I. Removal and Loading Costs	
Tankage	
Number of Contaminated Tanks	10
Volume of Contaminated Tank Construction Material (ft ³)	193
Number of Chemical Tanks	0
Disposal Void Factor	1.25
A. Labor to Remove and Load Tankage	
Number of Persons	2
Tanks/Day	1
Number of Days	10
\$/Day/Person	\$199.09
<i>Subtotal Removal Labor Costs</i>	<i>\$3,981.80</i>
B. Labor to Clean Chemical Tankage	
Number of Persons	1
Tanks/Day	1
Number of Days	0
\$/Day/Person	\$199.09
<i>Subtotal Cleaning Labor Costs</i>	<i>\$0.00</i>
C. Equipment	
Saws, scaffolding, etc.	\$6,000
<i>Subtotal Equipment Costs</i>	<i>\$6,000</i>
Total Equipment Removal and Loading Costs	\$9,981.80
II. Transportation and Disposal Costs (NRC-Licensed Facility)	
A. Tankage	
Volume of Tank Construction Material (ft ³)	193
Volume for Disposal Assuming Void Space (yd ³)	8.9
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
<i>Subtotal Tankage Transportation and Disposal Costs</i>	<i>\$1,972.60</i>
B. Contaminated PVC Pipe	
Volume of Shredded PVC Pipe (ft ³)	153.6
Volume for Disposal Assuming Void Space (yd ³)	7.1
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
<i>Subtotal Contaminated PVC Pipe Transportation and Disposal Costs</i>	<i>\$1,573.64</i>
C. Pumps	
Volume of Process Pumps (yd ³) (no void factor used)	2.4
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
<i>Subtotal Pump Transportation and Disposal Costs</i>	<i>\$531.94</i>
D. Filters (injection, backwash and yellowcake filters)	
Volume of Filters (yd ³) (no void factor used)	0.0
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
<i>Subtotal Filter Transportation and Disposal Costs</i>	<i>\$0.00</i>
E. Dryer	
Dryer Volume (yd ³) (no void factor used)	0.0
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
<i>Subtotal Dryer Transportation and Disposal Costs</i>	<i>\$0.00</i>
Total Contaminated Equipment Transportation and Disposal Costs	\$4,078.18

**Table P.1-6 Marsland Satellite Facility Equipment Decommissioning -
2013 Surety Estimate, Continued**

III. Transportation and Disposal (Solid Waste for Landfill Disposal)	
A. Cleaned Tankage	
Volume of Tank Construction Material (ft ³)	0
Number of Landfill Trips	1
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/Load)	\$912.00
Subtotal Tankage Transportation and Disposal Costs	\$912.00
B. Uncontaminated PVC Pipe	
Volume of Shredded PVC Pipe (ft ³)	0
Number of Landfill Trips	1
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/Load)	\$912.00
Subtotal PVC Pipe Transportation and Disposal Costs	\$912.00
Total Uncontaminated Equipment Transportation and Disposal Costs	\$1,824.00
IV. Supervisory Labor Costs During Plant Decommissioning	
Estimated Duration (months)	6
Engineer	\$48,256.62
Radiation Technician	\$27,321.72
Total Supervisory Labor Costs	\$75,578.34
SUBTOTAL EQUIPMENT REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL COSTS PER FACILITY	
Building Area (Ft ²)	34,000
Building Equipment Removal and Disposal Cost per Square Foot	\$2.69
TOTAL EQUIPMENT REMOVAL AND DISPOSAL COSTS	
	\$91,462.32

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-7 Marsland Building Demolition - 2013 Surety Estimate

Satellite Plant

I. Decontamination Costs	
A. Wall Decontamination	
Area to be Decontaminated (ft ²)	30,000
HCl Application Rate (Gallons/ft ²)	1
HCl Acid Cost	\$1.54
Subtotal Wall Decontamination Materials Costs	\$46,200.00
B. Concrete Floor Decontamination	
Area to be Decontaminated (ft ²)	9000
HCl Application Rate (Gallons/ft ²)	2
HCl Acid Cost	\$1.54
Subtotal Floor Decontamination Materials Costs	\$27,720.00
C. Decontamination Labor	
Labor (man-days)	2
Subtotal Decontamination Labor Cost	\$398.18
D. Decontamination Equipment Costs	
Sprayer pump	\$500
Recycle pump	\$500
Sprayer with hose	\$1,000
Subtotal Decontamination Equipment Costs	\$2,000
E. Decontamination Waste Disposal (to Ponds)	
Total gallons HCl waste	48,000
Pumping costs (5 HP/30 gpm)	\$496.33
Subtotal Decontamination Costs	\$76,814.51
Total Decontamination Costs	\$76,814.51
II. Demolition Costs	
Assumptions (based on 2007 costs):	
Dismantling interior steel, tanks, pumps, etc.	\$198,800.00
Dismantling plant building	\$99,400.00
A. Building Dismantling	
Dismantle interior components (2007 \$'s escalated by CPI)	\$202,179.60
Plant building dismantling (2007 \$'s escalated by CPI)	\$101,089.80
Subtotal Building Dismantling	\$303,269.40
B. Concrete Floor Removal	
Area of direct-dispose concrete floors (ft ²)	13,400
Removal Rate (\$/ft ²)	\$14.04
Subtotal Concrete Floor Removal	\$188,136.00
Total Demolition Costs	\$491,405.40

Table P.1-7 Marsland Building Demolition - 2013 Surety Estimate, Continued

III. Disposal Costs

A. Concrete Floor

Area of Direct-Dispose Concrete Floor (ft ²)	13,400
Average Thickness of Concrete Floor (ft)	0.75
Volume of Concrete Floor (ft ³)	10,050
Volume of Concrete Floor (Yd3)	372
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/Yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64

Subtotal Concrete Floor Disposal Costs *\$82,450.08*

Total Disposal Costs **\$82,450.08**

IV Plant Site Reclamation

A. Plant Site Earthwork

Material to be Moved (Yd3)	20,000
D8N Bulldozer Earthwork Rate (Yd3/hr)	700
D8N Hourly Rate	\$509.74

Subtotal Plant Site Earthwork *\$14,564.00*

B. Revegetation

Area requiring Revegetation (Ac)	4
Revegetation Unit Cost (\$/Ac)	\$300

Subtotal Plant Site Revegetation *\$1,200.00*

Total Plant Site Reclamation Costs **\$15,764.00**

SUBTOTAL BUILDING DEMOLITION AND DISPOSAL COSTS **\$666,433.99**

Building Area (Ft2) 34,138

Building Demolition Cost per Square Foot \$19.52

TOTAL BUILDING DEMOLITION AND DISPOSAL COSTS **\$666,433.99**

Table P.1-8 Marsland Miscellaneous Site Reclamation - 2013 Surety Estimate

I. Access Road Reclamation	
Assumptions	
Road Reclamation production rate (Yd3/hr)	200
Length of Main Access Roads (ft)	500
Average Main Access Road width (ft)	25
Depth of Main Access Road Gravel Surface (ft)	1
Surface Area of Main Access Road (Ac)	0.3
Length of Wellfield Access Roads (ft)	500
Average Wellfield Access Road width (ft)	12
Depth of Wellfield Access Road Gravel Surface (ft)	0.5
Surface Area of Wellfield Road (Ac)	0.1
A. Main Access Road Dirtwork	
Main Access Road Gravel Volume (Yd3)	463
Total reclamation time (hrs)	2
D8N Unit Operating Cost (\$/hr)	\$509.74
Subtotal Main Access Road Gravel Roadbase Removal Costs	\$1,019.48
B. Wellfield Road Dirtwork	
Wellfield Road Gravel Volume (Yd3)	111
Total reclamation time (hrs)	1
D8N Unit Operating Cost (\$/hr)	\$509.74
Subtotal Wellfield Road Gravel Roadbase Removal Costs	\$509.74
E. Discing/Seeding	
Assumptions	
Surface Area (acres)	0.4
Discing/Seeding Unit Cost (\$/acre)	\$300.00
Subtotal Discing/Seeding Costs	\$120.00
Total Access Road Reclamation Costs	\$1,649.22
II. Wastewater Pipeline Reclamation	
Assumptions	
Pipeline Removal Rate (ft./man-day)	67
Pipeline Shredding Rate (ft./man-day)	1,500
Number of Pond Pipelines	2
Length of Pond Pipelines (ft)	2,000
Average Pipe Size (Sch 40)	4
A. Pipeline Removal Costs	
Length of Pipelines (ft)	4,000
Removal Rate (ft/man-day)	67
Removal Labor Rate (\$/man-day)	\$199.09
Cat 924G Loader Use (days)	60
Cat 924G Loader Cost	\$87,643.20
Subtotal Pipeline Removal Costs	\$99,588.60
B. Pipeline Shredding Costs	
Length of Pipelines (ft)	4,000
Shredding Rate (ft/man-day)	1,500
Shredding Labor Rate (\$/man-day)	\$199.09
Shredder Use (days)	3
Shredder Cost	\$192.24
Subtotal Pipeline Shredding Costs	\$789.51

Table P.1-8 Marsland Miscellaneous Site Reclamation - 2013 Surety Estimate, Continued

C. Pipeline Transportation and Disposal (NRC-Licensed Facility)	
Pipe Diameter (inches)	4
Chipped Volume Reduction (ft ³ /ft)	0.0103
Subtotal Volume of Shredded PVC Pipe (yd ³)	1.5
Disposal Void Factor	1.25
Final Disposal Volume (yd ³)	1.88
Transportation and Disposal Unit Cost (\$/yd ³) (Unpackaged Bulk)	\$221.64
Subtotal Pipeline Disposal Costs	\$416.68
Total Wastewater Pipeline Reclamation Costs	\$100,794.79
III. Electrical Distribution System Removal	
Assumptions	
Length of High Voltage Lines	500
High Voltage Line Removal Rate (\$/ft.)	\$2.17
High Voltage Line Removal Cost (\$/ft.)	\$1,085.00
Substation Removal	\$1,175.00
Subtotal Electrical Distribution System Removal Costs	\$2,260.00
IV. Supervisory Labor Costs During Miscellaneous Reclamation	
Estimated Duration (months)	3
Engineer Rate (\$/month)	\$8,042.77
Total Engineer Labor	\$24,128.31
Radiation Technician Rate (\$/month)	\$4,553.62
Total Radiation Technician Labor	\$13,660.86
Total Supervisory Labor Costs	\$37,789.17
<hr/>	
TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS RECLAMATION COSTS	\$142,493.18

Sch = Schedule

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-9 Marsland Deep Disposal Well Reclamation - 2013 Surety Estimate

I. Cost Basis

A. Plugging and Abandonment

Cost Estimate from April 2009 2nd Well Permit Application for plugging and abandonment	\$60,292
April 2009 CPI	213.2
June 2011 CPI	229.5
Subtotal Escalated April 2009 Plugging and Abandonment Costs	\$64,901.57

B. Site Reclamation

Cost Estimate from April 2009 2nd Well Permit Application for site reclamation	\$2,500
April 2009 CPI	213.2
June 2011 CPI	229.5
Subtotal Escalated April 2009 Reclamation Costs	\$2,691.14

Subtotal Abandonment cost per well **\$67,592.71**

TOTAL DEEP DISPOSAL WELL RECLAMATION COSTS **\$67,592.71**

CPI: Consumer Price Index

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-10 Marsland Groundwater IX Treatment (GIX) Restoration (Unit Costs) - 2013 Surety Estimate

Assumptions:

- 1. All pumps are 5 hp pumping at 32 gpm
- 2. Cost of electricity = \$0.0830 Kw hr
- 3. Horsepower to kilowatt conversion = 0.746 Kw/HP
- 4. Operator labor costs = \$199.09 man-day
- 5. Labor costs are based on 36 pumps at 1,150 gpm

Wellfield Pumping Electrical Costs per 1000 Gallons (Includes bleed to the Deepwell / Evaporation Pond)

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{5 \text{ hp}}{32 \text{ gpm}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{60 \text{ min}} \times \frac{0.746 \text{ kwh}}{\text{hp}} \times \$0.0830 \text{ kwh} = \$0.161$$

Wellfield Pumping Labor Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{1 \text{ min}}{1150 \text{ gal}} \times \frac{1 \text{ man-day}}{1440 \text{ min}} \times \$199.09 \text{ man-day} \times 2 \text{ operators} = \$0.240$$

Groundwater IX Production Rate

$$1000 \frac{\text{gal}}{\text{min}} \times \frac{60 \text{ min}}{\text{hr}} \times \frac{24 \text{ hr}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{365 \text{ day}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1 \text{ year}}{12 \text{ month}} = 43,800,000 \frac{\text{gallons}}{\text{month}}$$

TOTAL GWS COSTS PER 1000 GALLONS

= \$ 0.40

Table P.1-11 Marsland Groundwater Reverse Osmosis (RO) Treatment (Unit Costs) - 2013 Surety Estimate

Assumptions:

- 1. All pumps are 5 hp pumping at 32 gpm
- 2 Membrane Replacement \$0.015 per 1000 gal
- 3 Cost of electricity = \$0.0830 Kw hr
- 4 Horsepower to kilowatt conversion = 0.746 Kw/HP
- 5 Operator labor costs = \$199.09 man-day
- 6 RO System horsepower requirements for 600 gpm rated flow based upon:
 - RO Unit Pump 195 hp
 - Permeate/Injection pump 60 hp
 - Waste pump (1(Bleed - Deepwell / Evap Ponds) 12 hp
 - TOTAL: 267 hp
- 7 Chemical costs:
 - Reductant = \$0.240 lb
 - Antiscalant = \$15.45 gal

Membrane Replacement Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{\$660 \text{ membrane cost / month}}{43,800,000 \text{ gallons month}} = \$ 0.015 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Wellfield Pumping Electrical Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{5 \text{ hp}}{32 \text{ gpm}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{60 \text{ min}} \times 0.746 \frac{\text{kwh}}{\text{hp}} \times \$ 0.0830 \frac{\text{kwh}}{\text{kwh}} = \$ 0.161 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Reverse Osmosis Electrical Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{267 \text{ hp}}{600 \text{ gpm}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{60 \text{ min}} \times 0.746 \frac{\text{kwh}}{\text{hp}} \times \$ 0.0830 \frac{\text{kwh}}{\text{kwh}} = \$ 0.459 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Reverse Osmosis Labor Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{1 \text{ min}}{600 \text{ gal}} \times \frac{1 \text{ man-day}}{1440 \text{ min}} \times \$199.09 \frac{\text{man-day}}{\text{man-day}} \times 2 \text{ operators} = \$ \$0.461 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Treatment chemical costs per 1000 Gallons

Antiscalant:

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{0.000008330 \text{ gal antiscalant}}{1 \text{ gal}} \times \$15.45 \frac{\text{gal antiscalant}}{\text{gal antiscalant}} = \$ \$0.129 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Reductant:

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{0.001040 \text{ lbs reductant}}{1 \text{ gal}} \times \$0.240 \frac{\text{lb reductant}}{\text{lb reductant}} = \$ \$0.250 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Reverse Osmosis Production Rate

$$1000 \text{ gal min} \times \frac{60 \text{ min}}{\text{hr}} \times \frac{24 \text{ hr}}{\text{day}} \times \frac{365 \text{ day}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1 \text{ year}}{12 \text{ month}} = 43,800,000 \text{ gallons month}$$

TOTAL RO COSTS PER 1000 GALLONS = \$ 1.48

RO = Reverse Osmosis
Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-12 Marsland Groundwater Recirculation (Unit Costs) - 2013 Surety Estimate

Assumptions:

- 1. All pumps are 5 hp pumping at 32 gpm
- 2. Cost of electricity = \$0.0830 Kw hr
- 3. Horsepower to kilowatt conversion = 0.746 Kw/HP
- 4. Operator labor costs = \$199.09 man-day
- 5. System horsepower requirements for 1,150 gpm rated flow based upon:
 injection pump 30 hp

Wellfield Pumping Electrical Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{5 \text{ hp}}{32 \text{ gpm}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{60 \text{ min}} \times \frac{0.746 \text{ kwh}}{\text{hp}} \times \$0.0830 \text{ kwh} = \$ 0.161 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Wellfield Injection Electrical Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{30 \text{ hp}}{1150 \text{ gpm}} \times \frac{1 \text{ hr}}{60 \text{ min}} \times \frac{0.746 \text{ kwh}}{\text{hp}} \times \$0.0830 \text{ kwh} = \$ 0.027 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Recirculation Labor Costs per 1000 Gallons

$$1000 \text{ gal} \times \frac{1 \text{ min}}{1150 \text{ gal}} \times \frac{1 \text{ man-day}}{1440 \text{ min}} \times \$199.09 \text{ man-day} \times 1 \text{ operators} = \$ 0.120 \text{ per Kgal}$$

Recirculation Production Rate

$$1150 \text{ gal} \times \frac{60 \text{ min}}{\text{hr}} \times \frac{24 \text{ hr}}{\text{day}} \times 365 \text{ day} \times \frac{1 \text{ year}}{12 \text{ month}} = 50,370,000 \text{ gallons month}$$

TOTAL RECIRCULATION COSTS PER 1000 GALLONS = \$ 0.31

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-13 Marsland Well Abandonment (Unit Costs) - 2013 Surety Estimate

Assumptions:

- 1 Use backhoe for 0.25 hr/well to dig, cut off, and cap well.
- 2 Drill rig used 2.5 hrs to plug well.
- 3 Labor for installing chips, etc. will require 2 workers at 0.5 hrs per well

Well Abandonment Costs					Cost per ft (based on 700 ft wells)
Labor Costs	1 hours	X \$ 24.89	per hour	=\$ 24.89	\$0.0356
Cat 416 Backhoe	0.25 hours	X \$ 122.98	per hour	=\$ 30.75	\$0.0439
Drill rig	2.5 hours	X \$ 163.34	per hour	=\$ 408.35	\$0.5834
Well Cap	1 each	X \$ 12.20	each	=\$ 12.20	\$0.0174
Materials per foot of well (Variable Cost)					
Cement	0.0714 lbs/ft	X \$ 0.140	per pound	=\$	\$0.0100
Bentonite Chips	0.007 tubes/ft	X \$ 8.50	per tube	=\$	\$0.0595
Plug Gel	0.0086 sacks/ft	X \$ 8.50	per sack	=\$	\$0.0731
Total Estimated Cost per Foot:					\$0.82

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-14 Marsland Five Year Mechanical Integrity Tests (MIT)

Assumptions:

- 1 Pulling Unit for 8 hr/day
- 2 MIT Unit for 8 hr/day
- 3 Labor for operation of pulling unit requires 2 workers (one operator & one laborer)
- 4 Labor for operation of MIT Unit requires 1 worker

MIT Costs per Well

Equipment and Labor:

Pulling Unit includes one operator

8 hours X \$ 22.63 per hour =\$ 181.04

Laborer

8 hours X \$ 24.89 per hour =\$ 199.12

MIT Unit includes one operator

8 hours X \$ 22.63 per hour =\$ 181.00

TOTAL MIT COST PER DAY =\$ 561.16

Wells Completed 6 per day

MIT COSTS PER WELL =\$ 93.53

MIT COSTS PER DEEP DISPOSAL WELL (2013 Cost) =\$ 6425

Revised 6/11/2013

Table P.1-15 Marsland Master Cost Basis - 2013 Surety Estimate (continued)

Electrical Costs				CPI Escalators (CPI-U, U.S. City Average)	
	<u>2012 Rate</u>	<u>2013 Est Rate</u>			
Power cost (adj for current actual cost)	\$0.0797	\$0.0830	kwHr	1988 CPI (average)	118.3
Kilowatt to Horsepower	0.746	0.746	Kw/HP	June 2012 CPI (deep well estimate)	213.2
Horsepower per gallon per minute	0.167	0.167	HP/gpm	2011 CPI (June 2011 used in last	225.7
				Current CPI (June 2011)	229.5
				2012 Escalation Factor	1.017
Labor Rates					
	<u>2012 Rate</u>	<u>2013 Est Rate (CPI)</u>			
Operator Labor Cost	\$195.76	\$199.09	day		
Pulling Unit Operator	\$178.00	\$181.03	day		
Engineer Cost	\$7,908.33	\$8,042.77	month		
Radiation Technician Costs	\$4,477.50	\$4,553.62	month		
Chemical Costs					
	<u>2012 Rate</u>	<u>2013 Est Rate</u>			
Antiscalant for RO (adj for current actual cost)	\$15.45	\$15.45	gal		
Reductant (adj for current actual cost)	\$0.24	\$0.24	lb		
Cement (adj for current actual cost)	\$0.14	\$0.14	pound		
Demonite Tubes (adj for current actual cost)	\$8.35	\$8.50	tube		
Saft (adj for current actual cost)	\$128.52	\$128.52	ton		
Plug Gel (adj for current actual cost)	\$8.40	\$8.50	sack		
Well Cap (adj for current actual cost)	\$12.00	\$12.20	each		
Hydrochloric Acid (adj for current actual cost)	\$1.54	\$1.54	gallon		
Analytical Costs					
Guideline 8 (contract lab adjusted for current contract cost)	\$248.00	\$248.00	analysis		
6 parameter (in-house) Est Rate (CPI)	\$50.00	\$50.85	analysis		
Other (radon, bio, etc.) Est Rate (CPI)	\$925.00	\$940.73	month		
Spare Parts					
	<u>2012 Rate</u>	<u>2013 Est Rate (CPI)</u>			
Restoration spare parts estimate	\$51,750.00	\$52,629.75	year		

Table P.1-15 Marsland Master Cost Basis - 2013 Surety Estimate (continued)

<u>Equipment Costs</u>						
<u>Equipment</u>	<u>Base Rental Rate (\$/hr)</u>	<u>Labor Costs (\$/hr)</u>	<u>Repair Reserve Costs (\$/hr)</u>	<u>Fuel Costs (\$/hr)</u>	<u>Mob & Demob (\$/hr)</u>	<u>Total (\$/hr)</u>
Cat 924G Loader	\$36.50	\$24.89	\$109.50	\$11.70	inc.	\$182.59
Cat 416 Backhoe	\$21.50	\$24.89	\$64.50	\$12.09	inc.	\$122.98
Shredder	\$8.01			inc.	inc.	\$8.01
Cat D8N Bulldozer	\$110.00	\$24.89	\$330.00	\$44.85	inc.	\$509.74
Pulling Unit	\$52.58	inc.	inc.	inc.	inc.	\$52.58
Mixing Unit	\$6.00			inc.	inc.	\$6.00
Drill Rig	\$163.34	inc.	inc.	inc.	inc.	\$163.34

Basis:

Drill rig based on current 2011 contract.

Equipment rates based on Cost Reference Guide - Equipment Watch 2012 updated addition.

Aug. 12 costs for off-road fuel. \$3.900 gallon

Labor rate based on current operator labor rate

<u>Pipe Volumes</u>			
<u>Nominal Pipe Size</u>	<u>Wall Thickness (in.)</u>	<u>Pipe OD (in.)</u>	<u>Volume per foot (ft³/ft)</u>
3/8-inch O2 hose		0.37500	0.03130
2-inch Sch. 40 downhole	0.15400	2.37500	0.00740
1-1/4-inch Sch. 40 stinger	0.14000	1.66000	0.00440
2-inch SDR 13.5 inj & prod.	0.14815	2.29630	0.00690
4-inch SDR 35	0.11430	4.22860	0.01030
6-inch Sch. 40 process pipe	0.28000	6.56000	0.03840
6-inch Trunkline	0.49100	6.56600	0.06510
8-inch Trunkline	0.62900	8.54800	0.11030
10-inch Trunkline	0.79600	10.65400	0.17120
12-inch Trunkline	0.94400	12.63700	0.24080

Table P.1-15 Marsland Master Cost Basis - 2013 Surety Estimate (continued)

Pipe Removal and Shredding Costs				
Activity	Removal Rate (ft/man-day)	Shredding Rate (ft/man-day)	Labor Rate (day)	Activity Cost per foot
2-inch SDR 13.5 inj & prod Removal	225		\$199.09	\$0.88
2-inch SDR 13.5 inj & prod Shredding		1920	\$199.09	\$0.10
Trunkline Removal	100		\$199.09	\$1.99
Trunkline Shredding		100	\$199.09	\$1.99
Downhole Pipe Removal	2000		\$199.09	\$0.10
Downhole Pipe Shredding		2250	\$199.09	\$0.09
Downhole Hose Removal	1000		\$199.09	\$0.20
Waste and RO Building Pipeline Removal	67		\$199.09	\$2.97
Waste and RO Building Pipeline Shredding		1500	\$199.09	\$0.15

Waste Disposal Costs								
Waste Form	Fee		Density Correction Factor (Tons/Yd ³)	Fee per Cubic Yard	Transport Cost	Total Transportation and Disposal		
Soil, Bulk Byproduct Material	\$166.75	per Ton	0.54	\$90.05	\$160.00	per Yd ³	\$250.05	per Yd ³
Unpackaged Bulk Byproduct Material (e.g., pipe, equipment)	\$146.75	per Ton	0.42	\$61.64	\$160.00	per Yd ³	\$221.64	per Yd ³
Solid Waste (landfill)	\$0.03	per Lb			Incl.	per Lb	\$0.03000	per Lb
Solid Waste (landfill)	\$912.00	per Load			Incl.	per Load	\$912.00	per Load
Void Factor (for disposal)	1.25							

Plant Dismantling							
Plant Components:	Number	Units	Estimated Disposal Volume	Units	Activity	Units	2012 Cost
Contaminated Tanks	10	each	19.3	Ft3 each	Dismantling method		\$ 198800
Uncontaminated Tanks	0	each	19.3	Ft3 each	Dismantling method		\$ 99400
Pumps	13	each	5	Ft3 each			
Downhole Pumps	0	each	0.5	Ft3 each	Concrete block	Current Cost \$/ft ²	14.04
Contaminated Piping	4000	feet	See estimate by piping size and material				
Uncontaminated Piping	0	feet					
Filters	0	each	100	Ft3 each			
Dryer	0	each	400	Ft3 each			
Average PVC Pipe Diameter (inches)	?						

Table P.1-15 Marsland Master Cost Basis - 2013 Surety Estimate (continued)

Plant Decontamination				
Direct Dispose Plant Floor Area	13400 ft ²	Decon Solution (HCl) Floor Application Rate	2	gal/ft ²
Uncontaminated Plant Floor Area	4400 ft ²			
Decontaminated Plant Floor Area*	9000 ft ²			
Average concrete thickness	0.75 ft			
Plant Wall Area	30000 ft ²	Decon Solution (HCl) Wall Application Rate	1	gal/ft ²

Revised 01/12/01

Crow Butte Resources
Marsland Project
Page 1 of 2

April 23, 2012

Rhonda Grantham
Supervisor Radiation Safety & Regulatory Affairs/RSO
86 Crow Butte Rd
Crawford, NE 69339

Subject: United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) Regulatory Guide 4.14 Lower Limits of Detection for the Marsland Baseline Samples.

Dear Rhonda:

As requested in conversation with David Blaida, Energy Laboratories, Inc. (ELI) Radiochemical Supervisor on April 20, 2012, the following is an explanation verifying the reported Minimum Detectable Concentrations/Lower Limits of Detection (MDC/LLD) values for the Marsland Baseline Project samples are in compliance with the USNRC regulatory guide 4.14, Section 5 "LLD" for the following requested analytes:

Analyte	MDC/LLD	MDC/LLD
Matrix	Water	Water
Radium 226	2E-10 uCi/ml	0.2 pCi/L
Thorium 230	2E-10 uCi/ml	0.2 pCi/L
Polonium 210	1E-9 uCi/ml	1.0 pCi/L
Lead 210	1E-9 uCi/ml	1.0 pCi/L
Uranium	2E-10 uCi/ml	0.2 pCi/L

Matrix	Soil/sediment (dry)	Soil/sediment (dry)
Radium 226	2E-7 uCi/g	0.2 pCi/g
Thorium 230	2E-7 uCi/g	0.2 pCi/g
Polonium 210	No guidance	No guidance
Lead 210	2E-7 uCi/g	0.2 pCi/g
Uranium	2E-7 uCi/g	0.2 pCi/g

Matrix	Vegetation, food & Fish (wet)	Vegetation, food & Fish (wet)
Radium 226	5E-8 uCi/kg	0.05 pCi/g
Thorium 230	2E-7 uCi/kg	0.2 pCi/g
Polonium 210	1E-6 uCi/kg	1.0 pCi/g
Lead 210	1E-6 uCi/kg	1.0 pCi/g
Uranium	2E-7 uCi/kg	0.2 pCi/g

ELI has met the criteria per the guidance suggested by the USNRC when reasonably achievable by available conventional laboratory methodology. If for some reason the MDC/LLD was not be met on the original analysis, the samples were recounted or re-analyzed until the 4.14 MDC/LLDs were achieved. If after

Crow Butte Resources
Marsland Project
Page 2 of 2

reanalysis these criteria still could not be met, the laboratory report included a narrative explanation with respect to one or more of the following:

1. Matrix interferences
2. Matrix effects
3. Inadequate sample volumes
4. Radiochemical concentrations were reported above the MDC/LLD

In addition, some of the analytes were reported to two significant figures. Regulatory Guide, 4.14 lists the LLDs to only one significant figure, therefore, it is of ELI's opinion that these should be rounded to the nearest significant figure. For example, 1.3 pCi/L equals 1 pCi/L.

Also, as mutually agreed, the concept of MDC vs. LLD is effectively a "non-issue" in that each calculation is slightly different but clearly generates identical sets of results.

Hopefully this is an adequate explanation of the issues as it pertains to the Marsland Expansion Area. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Dave Blaida or me.

Thank you,



Client Services Supervisor

Digitally signed by
Steve Dobos
Date: 2012.04.25 15:21:29 -06:00

Steve Dobos
Senior Project manager/Client Relations