

October 14, 2016

Mr. Dustin Czapla Colorado Division of Reclamation Mining and Safety 101 South 3rd, Suite 301 Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

Re: Restoration Completion Report Board Order Signed-March 3, 2016 Little Deadwood Gulch and Chief Portal May Day Idaho Mine Complex Permit No. M-1981-185 112d-1 Reclamation Permit

Dear Mr. Czapla,

The following is Wildcat Mining Corporation's (Wildcat) completion request for the restoratoration of the Little Deadwood Gulch (LDG) adjacent to the Chief Portal.. This completion report summarizes site activities pursuant to the approved Technical Revision (TR-8)¹. The original drainage plan was designed by Carroll & Lange-Manhard (Manhard) and submitted to the Division on March 18, 2013 and approved on April 1, 2013. (Attachment 1).

Pursuant the Colorado Mined Land Reclamation Board (Board) Order dated March 3, 2016, Wildcat committed to initiating site remedial activities on or before May 15, 2016 and to completing site remedial activities on or before July 1, 2016. At the request of Wildcat, the Board approved an extension to the deadline restoration to October 15, 2016. The extension was extended to allow Wildcat Mining Corporation the time to obtain permit approval from the Army Corp of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

On June 28, 2016, Wildcat submitted a Chief Portal "As-Built" completion report summarizing the portal and road stability report. The report was approved with two conditions. Conditions required the revegetation of the Chief Manway restored portal slope and the stabilization of the Incas access road and berm above the Chief Manway. Both conditions have been addressed.

On July 20, 2016, Wildcat signed a U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Consent Decree which required the implementation of an approved EPA/Army Corp of Engineers restoration plan. The Army Corp Nationwide permit was approved on September 30, 2016. The Nationwide permit is consistent with the CDRMS approved drainage restoration work plan

Wildcat Mining Corporation 3926 North State Hwy 67 Sedalia, Colorado 80135 303.832.7664

¹ Little Deadwood Gulch and Chief Portal Reclamation Report

Field construction was under the direction of Mr. Erich Rauber (PE) and the supervision of Mr. George M.L. Robison (CPG-5022). The following summarizes the Little Deadwood Gulch (LDG) drainage construction installation and revegetation completion activities:

- 1. Installed 100 foot-24 inch CMP pipe with end sections (11 percent grade) and a trash rack. The CMP is designed to convey the peak flow from a 10-year-24 hour storm (19.5 cubic feet per second (cfs)) (Manhard, 2013)² (See Table 1);
- 2. The CMP flow rate is estimated to be 12 feet per second. Pipe flow discharges onto a rip rapped (D50-12 inch) apron. (See Photos);
- 3. The 24-inch culvert was installed in accordance with TR-8 (Approved August 28, 2016);
- 4. Pipe discharges occurs approximately 7 feet below the down gradient fill crest (See Photo);
- 5. Gravity blocks (See Photo) were installed in front of the Chief manway (Figure 1);
- 6. To provide stability to site alluvial materials outside of the portal manway, gravity blocks were placed immediately upgradient and parallel to of the manway portal. The upgradient block extension is approximately 4-feet wide and approximately 16-feet long. (See photo). A manway entry ramp was constructed to permit mine rescue crews to gain access to the mine in the event of an emergency.
- 7. Installed a 12-inch CMP sub drain (5.5 percent grade) at the entrance of the 66-inch culvert to drain collected water that may collect in front of the manway. (See Photo) Water from the manway entrance will be gravity drained to a downgradient point near the crest of the LDG bench and in close proximity to the LDG-24 inch CMP discharge point. (See Photo)
- 8. Constructed a trapezoidal channel. (See Photo-See TR-5 and TR-8 design);
- 9. The disturbed area was revegetated in accordance with TR-5 approved design;
- 10. BMPs (wattles, silt fences, rip rap) were installed in accordance with (TR-05; April 1, 2013);
- 11. Debris was removed from the drainage channel and disposed offsite; and,
- 12. Submitted a drainage "as-built" drawings (See Figure 2).

 $^{^2}$ Appendix A Little Deadwood Gulch Drainage Analysis –Technical Revision-5, Carroll & Lange-Manhard, March, 2013

Site construction actives were completed on October 7, and revegetated on October 8, with erosion control BMPs installed on October 10, 2016.

Wildcat has completed site activities in accordance with the Board order and requests the completion report be approved.

Regards

George M.L. Robinson-CPG-2055 President Wildcat Mining Corporation

Figures

Figure 1 Approved Drainage Alignment; Figure 2 –Little Deadwood Gulch Drainage As-Built Drainage Map

Photos

Photo 1-Little Deadwood Gulch Gravity Blocks;Photo 2-Manway Drainage Control;Photo 3-Little Deadwood Gulch Upgradient Perspective;Photo 4-Little Deadwood Gulch Downgradient Alignment

Attachment

Attachment A-LDG Restoration Plan

Figures

Figure 1 – Approved Drainage Alignment

Figure 2 –Little Deadwood Gulch Drainage –Chief Drainage Completion Report



Figure 1 24 inch CMP and 4-6 inch sub drain Installation Alignment Chief-Little Deadwood Gulch Drainage





	Date: 10-14-16
Project No.: CHIEF	Checked By: J.E.M.
<i>Scale:</i> $1''=20'$	Prepared By: J.E.M.
ty, Colorado	La Plata County, Colorado
36N, R11W, N.M.P.M.	located in Section 28, T36N, R11W, N.M.P.M.
NE ADIT"	"CHIEF MINE ADIT"
ation	Renovation

Photos

Photo 1-Gravity Blocks Photo 2-Manway Drainage Control Photo 3-Little Deadwood Gulch Upgradient Drainage Photo 4-Little Deadwood Gulch Upgradient Drainage

Repaired Access Road Above Chief Portal

Rock Barrier-above Chief Man Way Head Wall

Restored Chief Headwall

Incas access Road



Manway Barriers Construction



Chief Manway-with Sub drain

12 inch CMP Sub Drain 66 inch CMP Man Way

Manway-Post Construction



LDG-Chief Down Gradient Channel Pre-Construction



LDG-Chief Down Gradient Channel Post Construction



LDG-Upgradient Culvert End Section w/o Trash Rack



LDG-Chief Channel Construction



Chief-LDG Post Construction



Chief-LDG Post Construction



Chief Manway Access Road



Chief – LDG Drainage Reclaimed



Erosion Control Blanket Installation Chief – LDG Revegetation



Erosion Control Blanket Installation Chief –LDG Revegetation-Upgradient



Erosion Control Blanket Installation Chief –LDG Revegetation-Upgradient



Erosion Control Blanket Installation Chief –LDG Revegetation-Adjacent to Manway



Attachment

Attachment A-LDG Restoration Plan

Civil Engineering

Surveying

Water Resources Management

Water & Wastewater

Engineering

Supply Chain Logistics

Construction Management

CARROLL & LANGE-MANHARD

Mr. Dustin Czapla Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety 101 South 3rd Street, Suite 301 Grand Junction, CO 81501

INTRODUCTION

March 18, 2013

This Work Plan presents Wildcat Mining Corporation's (Wildcat) approach to remove run-of-mine rock that was placed within the Little Deadwood Gulch (LDG), install a culvert to convey the flows in the LDF and create a bench area for egress from the Chief Portal (Phase 1). After material has been removed from the LDG and the bench has been graded, Wildcat will stabilize the highwall above the Chief Portal and repair the manway exit used for emergency escape from the mine and for mine ventilation.

Wildcat is proposing to operate the May Day Idaho Mine Complex and activated MSHA mine identification (ID) number 05-03674. Wildcat will implement the corrective actions described herein when all of the following conditions have been met:

- 1. Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (DRMS) approval of this work plan;
- 2. Approval of Wildcat's Restoration Plan (which includes this Work Plan) from the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPS);
- 3. Suitable construction weather and ground conditions.

Historical mining activities constructed the Chief Portal and disposed run-of-mine rock in the Little Deadwood Gulch drainage channel. A portion of the drainage channel was further disturbed in 2009. In early 2010, a cease and desist order to conduct any mining related activities, including operating equipment without written authorization from DRMS was issued to Wildcat. Wildcat has followed the cease and desist order and has been unable to complete any modifications to the LDG since that time.

Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued an order to Wildcat on April 9, 2012 for compliance for minor fills in waters of the U.S. Wildcat has prepared a separate restoration plan as required by the EPA. The work in this restoration plan will be consistent with the work outlined in this work plan. The EPA will be responsible for verifying compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

After a site investigation by DRMS, an order was issued (MV-2010-020) for constructing an illegal portal, the Chief Portal, near the existing May Day 3 level. Wildcat submitted as Exhibit D, Attachment D-4 to its amended Section 112d permit application the Chief Drainage Channel Reclamation Work Plan (the Original Work Plan). This Original Work Plan generally addressed existing drainage conditions, construction activities required to remove disposed rock from the LDG and stabilization activities after construction was completed. Additional information was required at the time of approval of the Original Work Plan, including a geotechnical stability analysis that demonstrates that the proposed means of stabilization of the Chief Portal will have an acceptable factor of safety and the removal of all mine waste

from the LDG. Wildcat committed to submitting a Technical Revision (TR) for review and approval by DRMS once the additional information was available.

The proposed work to remove debris from the Little Deadwood Gulch and stabilize the highwall above the Chief Portal will be broken into two phases as outlined below:

Phase 1 – Removal of mine debris from Little Deadwood Gulch:

- 1. Installation of erosion and sediment control BMP's at the site.
- 2. Remove approximately 550 cubic yards of unauthorized fill from the LDG. Removed material will be stockpiled and used for stabilization of the highwall above the Chief Portal.
- 3. Installation of a 24" culvert to allow the LDG to flow along its historical path.
- 4. Grade a bench area above the culvert that will provide vehicular access to the emergency manway for the Chief Portal and install BMP's to prevent erosion while vegetation establishes.
- 5. Complete riparian and channel restoration activities required by the Restoration Plan that was prepared for the EPA. This work in the Wetland Restoration Plan is beyond the requirements of this TR and will be overseen by the EPA and/or the USACE.

Phase 2 – Stabilize the highwall above the Chief Portal

- 1. Remove debris and loose dirt from the area immediately above the portal entrance. All loose dirt removed will be stockpiled for use in reconstruction of the highwall. Trees, roots and trash remove during this portion of the project will be disposed in a landfill.
- Reconstruct the highwall above the Chief Portal to meet the recommendations stated in the Rule 6.5 Geotechnical Stability Report – Chief Portal, dated March 16, 2013, prepared by Wildcat Mining Corporation (the Geotechnical Stability Report), completed by J. Erich Rauber, PE.
- 3. Extend the portal opening, through the use of a 66" pipe to the toe of the backfilled slope.
- 4. Stabilize the existing access road to May Day 3 and the portal access road. Stabilization includes scarifying, moisture treating and compaction of the existing road alignment.
- 5. Installation of final BMP's to re-establish vegetation and stabilize the disturbed areas.

WORK PLAN

The following presents a corrective action work plan to remove debris from the LDG, install a culvert within the channel, stabilize the highwall and access road immediately above the Chief Portal and repair the emergency manway exit at the Chief Portal. Additional investigations were initiated to evaluate the soil conditions in the immediate vicinity of the Chief Portal. Based on those recommendations, the following design has been prepared to meet the conditions imposed by DRMS as part of the conditionally approved 112d permit. This TR uses current geotechnical and topographic data to further refine the design that was presented in the Original Work Plan and prepare the final construction documents for the Little Deadwood Gulch and Chief Portal.

Phase 1 Scope of Work

Design Analysis:

To determine the amount of run-of-mine rock that was placed within the drainage way of the LDG that will be removed, an analysis was completed of the slopes and cross sections of the Gulch upstream and downstream of the disturbed area. Cross sections were cut on a 25-foot interval to determine approximate side slopes of the Gulch in an undisturbed state as well as to determine the approximate longitudinal grade prior to rock being placed within the Gulch. The existing profile of the Gulch and the cross sections are shown in Appendix B, Figures 1, 2, 2A and 2B.

Based on this analysis, it was determined that the side slope on the west side of the Gulch was approximately 4:1 and the side slope on the east side of the drainage way varies from approximately 2:1 to approximately 8:1. The longitudinal slope of the Gulch flattens in front of the Chief Portal to about 15%, with longitudinal slopes of approximately 25% upstream and 30% downstream of the portal area. Using these parameters, the approximate configuration of the LDG would be as shown in Figure 4 – Proposed Little Deadwood Gulch Grading (see Appendix B). It will be necessary to cut the area along the channel per Figure 4 to remove the debris from the channel prior to placing the culvert in the channel and grading the bench over the culvert.

A drainage analysis was completed for the LDG (at this point in the drainage way) to determine the maximum flows that could be conveyed by a 24" culvert (vertical constraints prohibit a larger pipe). The Little Deadwood Gulch has a tributary area of approximately 311 acres and a 10-year and 100-year, 24 hour flow of 19.5 and 87 cubic feet per second (cfs), respectively. Using these numbers, a CulvertMaster calculation was completed and it was determined that a 24" RCP could convey 29.4 cfs. The remaining run-off will overtop the pipe and flow across the bench. The bench area has been graded as a trapezoidal channel with a 1-foot depth and a minimum bottom width of 10 feet. Calculations were run on a channel of these dimensions and it was determined that 113 cfs could be conveyed. During a 100-year event, 57.6 cfs would overtop the culvert, so there will be approximately 0.3 feet of freeboard during this storm event. Drainage calculations are shown in Appendix A.

Construction of Improvements:

Prior to the start of construction, wetlands within the project area will be delineated and clearly marked to meet the EPA order and remain in compliance with the Clean Water Act. After wetlands have been delineated, construction will begin with installation of necessary runoff and erosion BMP controls as shown on Figure 3 – Initial SWMP in Appendix B. Following installation of these controls, grading operations will begin by removing debris from the LDG to meet the proposed grading shown in Figure 4.

It is estimated that approximately 550 cubic yards will be excavated from the LDG. As shown in Figure 5 – Stockpile Areas, all of the excavated material to be stockpiled will be transported to May Day 3 for storage and to construct the bench and to repair the highwall above the Chief Portal. The stockpile will be surrounded with silt fence and, if it will remain undisturbed for more than 30 days, seeded and mulched.

After the material has been removed from the LDG, a 24" RCP culvert will be installed as shown in Figure 6 – Little Deadwood Gulch Culvert Plan & Profile. A bench will be graded over the top of the pipe to provide emergency egress from the Chief portal. The proposed grading of this bench is also shown on Figure 6.

After completion of grading activities, all disturbed areas will need to be stabilized to prevent erosion. Rock Check Dams will be placed along the flow line of the channel above and below the culvert to slow the velocity of run-off and prevent scouring. Seeding and mulch will be placed on all disturbed areas. Due to the high probability that water will flow through this area, it is recommended that slopes greater than 3:1 disturbed during grading activities be covered with erosion control blankets. Erosion control measures are shown on Figure 7 – Interim SWMP.

Phase 2 Scope of Work

After work within the LDG has been completed, as outlined above, construction will proceed to stabilizing the highwall and the access road immediately above the existing portal and repair of the existing manway exit from the mine. A geotechnical stability report was completed on March 16, 2013 by Wildcat Mining Corporation that gives recommendations on how to stabilize the highwall.

Geotechnical Investigation:

The Rule 6.5 Geotechnical Stability Report – Chief Portal, dated March 16, 2013, prepared by Wildcat Minning Corporation (the Geotechnical Stability Report) was completed by J. Erich Rauber, PE to provide recommendations to stabilize the highwall above the Chief Portal. The full Geotechnical Stability Report can be found in Appendix D.

The subsurface investigation included excavating five test pits, two on the bench in front of the portal and three along the existing access road to May Day 3, and performing moisture content, Atterberg Limits and compaction tests on samples taken from each of the test pits. Based on this analysis, the Geotechnical Stability Report made the following recommendations for the reconstruction of the highwall in Section 5.0 – Recommendations:

- Loose fill and debris should be removed from the highwall area and a buttress should be constructed to establish a pad on which the portal improvements can be supported. A typical detail of the buttress can be found in the Appendix of the Geotechnical Stability Report.
- The finished slope of the highwall shall not exceed 1.5:1.
- Fill materials should be free of organic material with the largest particle sizes less than six inches. Fill should be placed in layers of eight inches or less, moisture conditioned and compacted.

Additional recommendations were provided for the repair of the portal entrance and repair of the Portal Access Road.

Construction of Improvements:

Reconstruction of the highwall will start with the removal of trees, vegetation, debris and loose dirt and rock from the collapsed area above the portal. The trees, vegetation and debris will be hauled off-site and disposed of in a landfill. The loose dirt and rock will be stockpiled with the material removed from the LDG on May Day 3.

Once the highwall has been cleared, the Contractor will reconstruct the slope to meet the design prepared in Figure 8 – Highwall Grading Plan (see Appendix C) and the recommendations of the Geotechnical Stability Report.

The portal opening will need to be extended as part of the reconstruction of the highwall because the proposed slope will completely cover the existing opening. To extend this emergency exit, a 66-inch pipe will be installed at a 11% slope from the proposed retaining wall to a point that catches inside the existing opening. A plan and profile of this design has been provided in Figure 9 – Chief Portal Plan & Profile.

The portal access road and the existing access road above the Chief Portal will need to be stabilized after the grading of the highwall has been completed. The alignment and elevations of both of these access roads will remain the same, but both roads will need to be scarified, moisture treated and compacted to meet the recommendations of the Geotechnical Stability Report.

The contractor will need to place erosion control measures (BMP's) on the proposed improvements as work is completed. Slopes will need to be stabilized with seeding and mulching or hydromulch with a tackifier. All disturbed slopes steeper than 3:1 shall also have erosion control blankets to prevent

stormwater run-off from washing the seed and mulch or hydromulch off of the slope prior to vegetation becoming established. Erosion control measures are shown on Figure 10 – Final SWMP.

At the completion of mining operations, the improvements discussed in this work plan will be left in place. Maintenance will be performed on the culvert to repair any damage that occurred during mining operations and disturbed areas will be reseeded. The seeded areas will be planted with the seed mix summarized in the approved mine permit (shown below) and steep slopes will be protected with erosion control blankets to prevent erosion while the seed is establishing.

Seed Mix (pending approval from USACE/EPA):

- 35% Slender Wheatgrass (7 lbs/ac)
- 35% Mountain Brome (7 lbs/ac)
- 10% Blue Bunch Wheat Grass (2 lbs/ac)
- 10% Canadian Wild Rye (2 lbs/ac)
- 10% Lewis Flax (2 lbs/ac)

APPENDIX A

LITTLE DEADWOOD GULCH
DRAINAGE ANALYSIS

÷	ł
g	D D
å	-

		Table				
		Chief Channel Design Calculations	n Calculations			
		wingcat inining company Durango, Colorado	company lorado			
Annual Rainfall	19.9 inches					
Snowfall	68.8 inches					
Average Temp High	62 7 inches	~ .				
		0				
Raîn fall low	May					
Rain fall high	August					
Pan Evaporation	37.8 inches	10			×	
Book Elow (Timo II Ctorm Ct	onn Clane 14687 alone					
Lean riuw (I the II storin-steep slope - 10% is	adois «ot < adois daa					
Figure D2)						
NRCS Runoff Curve Number 58	58					
				Drainage		
				Area	CFS/inch	
Return Period	Rainfall Duration	Rainfall Amount	Runoff	(acres)	Runoff	Peak flow
۲ ۲	7.0	1 20	000	514	150	
4 ⁷	4 ¢	0	0.00	110		0.0 T 04
D T	74	0,1	5T'N	775		C.ET
25	24	3.5	0.45	311	150	67.5
100	24	3.78	0.58	311	150	87.0
		Sq feet	Acres	311		
Drainage Area	311 acres	es				
Reference						
U.S. Department of Commerce, 1961, Technical Paper 4 and Return Periods fromm 1 to 100 years. Washington	ce, 1961, Technical Pa to 100 years. Washin	per 40-Rainfall Frequency gton , D.C.	/ Atlas of the L	Inited State	s for Durat	U.S. Department of Commerce, 1961, Technical Paper 40-Rainfall Frequency Atlas of the United States for Durations from 30 minutes to 24 hours and Return Periods fromm 1 to 100 years. Washington , D.C.
Wilkes, S. Glade and Erke C. King, 1 Uraban Hydrology for Small Water	King, 1975, Procedure: Water	s forDetermining Peak Flo	ows in Colorad	o, Incorpor	ateds and S	Wilkes, S. Glade and Erke C. King, 1975, Procedures forDetermining Peak Flows in Colorado, Incorporateds and Supplements Technica Release No. 55 Uraban Hydrology for Small Water
					3	
Soil Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Naltion Engineering Handbook, Section 4- Hydrology NEH-4.	oil Conservation Naltion	n Engineering Handbook,	Section 4- Hyo	Irology NEH	Ą	
Culvert Master						

December 23, 2009

Culvert Calculator Report Chief LDG Culvert

Solve For: Discharge

Culvert Summary				
Allowable HW Elevation	9,294.00 ft	Headwater Depth/Height	2.00	
Computed Headwater Eleva	9,294.00 ft	Discharge	29.44	cfs
Inlet Control HW Elev.	9,294.00 ft	Tailwater Elevation	9,273.20	ft
Outlet Control HW Elev.	9,293.60 ft	Control Type	Inlet Control	
Grades				
Upstream Invert	9,290.00 ft	Downstream Invert	9,273.15	ft
Length	102.90 ft	Constructed Slope	0.163751	
Hydraulic Profile				
Profile	S2	Depth, Downstream	0.80	ft
Slope Type	Steep	Normal Depth	0.78	
Flow Regime	Supercritical	Critical Depth	1.85	
Velocity Downstream	25.17 ft/	•	0.014663	ft/ft
Section				
Section Shape	Circular	Mannings Coefficient	0.013	
Section Material	Concrete	Span	2.00	ft
Section Size	24 inch	Rise	2.00	ft
Number Sections	1			
Outlet Control Properties				
Outlet Control HW Elev.	9,293.60 ft	Upstream Velocity Head	1.46	ft
Ke	0.20	Entrance Loss	0.29	ft
Inlet Control Properties				
Inlet Control HW Elev.	9,294.00 ft	Flow Control	N/A	
	nd projecting	Area Full	3.1	ft²
K	0.00450	HDS 5 Chart	1	
М	2.00000	HDS 5 Scale	3	
С	0.03170	Equation Form	1	
Y	0.69000			

	Chief Ben	ch Max F	Flow
Project Description			
Friction Method	Manning Formula		
Solve For	Discharge		
Input Data			
Roughness Coefficient		0.069	
Channel Slope		20.000	%
Normal Depth		1.00	ft
Left Side Slope		4.00	ft/ft (H:V)
Right Side Slope		4.00	ft/ft (H:V)
Bottom Width		10.00	ft
Results			
Discharge		113.00	ft³/s
Flow Area		14.00	ft²
Wetted Perimeter		18.25	ft
Hydraulic Radius		0.77	ft
Top Width		18.00	ft
Critical Depth		1.32	ft
Critical Slope		0.07132	ft/ft
Velocity		8.07	ft/s
Velocity Head		1.01	ft
Specific Energy		2.01	ft
Froude Number		1.61	
Flow Type	Supercritical		
GVF Input Data			
Downstream Depth		0.00	ft
Length		0.00	ft
Number Of Steps		0	
GVF Output Data			
Upstream Depth		0.00	ft
Profile Description			
Profile Headloss		0.00	ft
Downstream Velocity		Infinity	ft/s
Upstream Velocity		Infinity	ft/s
Normal Depth		1.00	ft
Critical Depth		1.32	ft
Channel Slope		20.000	%
		20.000	/0

3/8/2013 2:27:14 PM

Bentley Systems, Inc.Bentley FlowMaster V8i (SELECTseries 1) [08.11.01.03]27 Siemons Company Drive Suite 200 W Watertown, CT 06795 USA +1-203-755-1666Page 1 of 2
Chief Bench 100-year Flow

Project Description

Friction Method Solve For	Manning Formula Normal Depth	
Input Data		
Roughness Coefficient	0.069	
Channel Slope	20.000	%
Normal Depth	0.69	ft
Left Side Slope	4.00	ft/ft (H:V)
Right Side Slope	4.00	ft/ft (H:V)
Bottom Width	10.00	ft
Discharge	57.60	ft³/s

Cross Section Image



V:1 \(\scredit H:1\)

APPENDIX B – PHASE 1 CONSTRUCTION FIGURES

- FIGURE 1 EXISTING CONDITIONS & LITTLE DEADWOOD GULCH PROFILE
- FIGURE 2, 2A AND 2B LITTLE DEADWOOD GULCH CROSS SECTIONS
- FIGURE 3 INITIAL SWMP
- FIGURE 4 PROPOSED LITTLE DEADWOOD GULCH GRADING
- FIGURE 5 STOCKPILE AREAS
- FIGURE 6 LDG CULVERT PLAN & PROFILE
- FIGURE 7 INTERIM SWMP



















4+25

4+50





Updated SWMP.dwg nitia М TR \Drawings \Figure Portal Chief 0 ία. Δ DRMS Drawings DWD Name: Dwg :03









.; Ш Updated gwb. SWMP Interim ഗ Figure TR \Drawings ` Porta Chief 0 Urawinas Name: Dwg 22

APPENDIX C – PHASE 2 CONSTRUCTION FIGURES

- FIGURE 8 HIGHWALL GRADING PLAN
- FIGURE 9 CHIEF PORTAL PLAN & PROFILE
- FIGURE 10 FINAL SWMP





dmadruga В. Updated Profile.dwg 2 Plan Portal Chief σ TR\Drawings\Figure Portal Chief Drawings Ena (pwb) Wmcduc 'n Name: Dwg ~



Updated gwb. SWMP Final 0 Figure TR \Drawings \ Portal Chief 0 ία. Δ DRMS Urawinas DWD Name: Dwg 25

APPENDIX D

- RULE 6.5 GEOTECHNICAL STABILITY REPORT
 - CHIEF PORTAL



MAY DAY IDAHO MINE COMPLEX WILDCAT MINING CORPORATION

Rule 6.5 Geotechnical Stability Report Chief Portal March 16, 2013

	Signa	ture Block
Author	John Erich Rauber, P.E. Professional Engineer CO License #26647	RADO LICENSE RICH STERICH SCOURT RICH STERICH

Table of Contents

Pag	<u>3e</u>
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Site Description	1
2.0 Investigation	1
3.0 Site Conditions	2
3.1 Geology	2
3.2 Surface Conditions	2
3.3 Subsurface Conditions	
4.0 Conclusions	3
4.1 Portal Slope Stability	3
5.0 Recommendations	3
5.1 Portal Slope	3
5.2 Retaining Walls	
5.3 Portal Exit Design Loads	
5.4 Portal Access Road	
6.0 References	5

List of Tables

Table 1	Design Lateral Earth Pressures
Table 2	Design Pressures on Portal Structure for Various Heights of Compacted Fill

List of Figures

Figure 1	Location Map
Figure 2	Site Map
Figure 3	Photograph of Slope Above Chief Portal
Figure 4	Typical Fill Over Slope Construction

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Test Pit Logs
Appendix B	Laboratory Testing Results

1.0 Introduction

This report presents the results of a geotechnical investigation performed in connection with planned improvements to the Chief Portal (the portal) located on Little Deadwood Gulch at the May Day Idaho Mine Complex, on County Road 124, Hesperus, La Plata County, Colorado (Figure 1). This investigation was performed to provide criteria for design of planned improvements, and in fulfillment of requirements for additional geotechnical investigation activities as described in the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety's sixth adequacy letter dated September 30, 2011, and the Permit 112d-1 Permit approval, dated December 12, 2011. The scope of work included reviewing existing information, performing a subsurface investigation, field and laboratory testing, engineering analyses to develop criteria for design of the portal improvements, and preparation of this report.

1.1 Site Description

Historical mining activities (pre-1926) included construction of the portal, and disposing of run-of mine-rock in the adjacent Little Deadwood Gulch (the drainage channel), a tributary to the La Plata River. The portal was reconstructed in 2009 and the bench leading to the portal was graded to remove debris at the portal entrance.

1.2. Objectives of the Work

The objectives of the planned improvements to the portal are listed below.

- 1. Remove pre-1985 fill from and re-establish the pre-mine drainage channel in Little Deadwood Gulch;
- 2. Re-establish, and stabilize the portal as a escape manway and for mine ventilation;
- 3. Stabilize the section of Incas Road above the portal; and
- 4. Maintain all-terrain vehicle access to portal.

2.0 Investigation

The investigation included a document review, subsurface investigation, and geotechnical analysis. Existing maps and publications of the geology of the portal vicinity were reviewed and potential geological hazards discussed with Dr. David Gonzales of Fort Lewis College (Gonzales, 2012).

The subsurface investigation included excavating five test pits at the approximate locations shown in Figure 2. Test pits were excavated with a backhoe and extended to practical

excavation refusal, approximately 4 to 7 feet deep¹. Test pit locations were surveyed by Mountain Man Surveying of Durango, Colorado. The field engineer, David McLay, logged the pits and obtained bulk samples of the materials encountered. Logs of test pits are presented in Appendix A.

Bulk samples collected from the test pits were placed in sealable 5-gallon buckets. They were observed to confirm field classifications; selected samples were transported to Terracon Materials Testing Laboratory in Farmington, New Mexico for laboratory testing. Laboratory tests performed included the following:

- Moisture Content (ASTM D2216-10)
- Atterberg Limits (ASTM D4318 10)
- Compaction (ASTM D1557 09)

The laboratory results are presented in Appendix B.

3.0 Site Conditions

3.1 Geology

The geology in the portal area generally consists of 5 to 7 feet of Holocene or Late Pleistocene age colluvium, ranging from unsorted, clast-supported, pebble to boulder gravel in a sandy or silty matrix to matrix-supported gravelly sand or clayey silt (CGS, 2000). Underlying the colluvium is bedrock consisting of brecciated Entrada Sandstone and Pony Express Limestone. Although there are numerous fractures in the bedrock, they are generally sealed by calcite and quartz. The fractures tend to be random and thus do not have a preferred orientation (Gonzales, 2012).

3.2 Surface Conditions

As shown on Figure 3, surface conditions on the slope above the portal consists primarily of colluvium. During the 2009 portal reconstruction, material was removed directly above the portal, causing some of the colluvial material to fall down the slope. The slope above the portal is approximately 50 feet high and has an approximate slope of 1:1 (horizontal:vertical). The portal is partially covered with rock and fill. There is an approximate 1,200 square-foot bench south of the portal. The access road to the portal from the Incas Access Road is approximately 10 to 12 feet wide, and is at an approximate 3:1 downward slope.

¹ Test borings were planned but not installed during the Chief Portal investigation. Attempts to access to the portal location by the drilling rig were not successful.

3.3 Subsurface Conditions

As noted above, the material exposed on the slope above the portal primarily consists of colluvium. These materials consist of dense to very dense angular to subrounded cobbles from 2 to 6 inches in diameter in a sandy silt/clay matrix; occasional boulders up to 18 inches are also present.

Test pits excavated on the portal bench indicate fill materials consists of loose to medium dense lean gravelly sandy silt/clay overlying colluvium. Bedrock was not encountered, but based on mapping performed by Dr. Gonzales and surrounding oucrops, it is estimated to be less than 10 feet deep.

As discussed above, some colluvial material has been removed directly above the portal during its 2009 reconstruction which, in turn, undermined the slope and created the unstable condition in Figure 3.

4.0 Conclusions

4.1 **Portal Slope Stability**

On the basis of the geotechnical investigation and analysis, we conclude that the portal repair is feasible. The primary stability concerns include the following:

- Loose, poorly or uncompacted fill on the portal bench and on the outboard side of the above Incas Access Road
- Steep marginally stable slopes above the portal

The potential impacts associated with these concerns can be minimized by incorporating the following recommendations in the portal and Little Deadwood Gulch drainage channel design.

5.0 Recommendations

5.1 Portal Slope

Following removal of fill and debris from the drainage channel, a buttress should be constructed to establish a pad on which portal improvements can be supported and the slope above the portal stabilized. Figure 4 presents recommendations for fill over slope (buttress) construction. The buttress should extend at least 10 feet beyond the lateral extent of the portal, and be keyed into stiff colluvium or rock beneath the fill. The buttress width and keyway depth should be observed by the geotechnical engineer to check that suitable bearing materials are exposed. The slope of the buttress fill should be no steeper than 1.5:1 horizontal:vertical.

Materials used as fill should be free of organic material, have a liquid limit and plasticity index less than 30 and 15, respectively, with the largest particle sizes less than six inches. The investigation indicates onsite materials will generally be suitable for use as fill. The fill should

be placed in layers less than 8 inches thick, moisture conditioned to within 3 percent of the optimum moisture content, and be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction per ASTM D1557-09. Oversize rocks should be removed during fill placement and stockpiled at a geotechnically stable location for future use as slope revetment or rip rap as necessary.

During placement, the fill should be benched (Figure 4) at least 3 feet into the existing slope. The resulting bench should be smooth and non-yielding, and slope to drain away from the portal. The buttress fill should then extend upslope to the level of the Incas Access Road above. Upon completion, resulting slope should be trimmed of loose material and planted with ground cover appropriate to the area. The fill materials are highly erodible and thus should be protected until vegetation becomes established.

Surface water runoff should be intercepted and diverted from the top of the buttress using v-ditches or graded berms. Concentrated flows should be collected in a lined ditch or closed pipe and discharged away from the slope face into natural drainages. Energy dissipators should be provided as necessary to prevent concentrated flows from causing erosion.

To prevent the development of hydrostatic pressures within/behind the buttress, subdrainage should be installed as shown in Figure 4. The keyway subdrain, like the keyway itself, should extend to dense/stiff colluvium or rock over the entire width of the buttress. The geotechnical engineer should observe the keyway bottom to check that suitable bearing materials are exposed. If seepage zones or signs thereof are encountered during buttress construction, intermediate subdrains should be installed to intercept these zones.

5.2 Retaining Walls

If existing slopes above the portal preclude a buttress sloping a 1.5:1 or flatter extending from the portal to the Incas Access Road, retaining walls will be required. Retaining walls should be designed to resist lateral earth pressures imposed on them from the sloping buttress fill. Use the lateral earth pressures summarized in Table 1 for design.

Backfill Slope	Design Lateral Pressure
	$(pcf)^1$
1.5:1	63
1.75:1	49
2:1	44

 Table 1. Design Lateral Earth Pressures

From Air Force AFM 88-3, Chapter 14.

¹ Equivalent fluid pressure

Retaining wall foundations can be supported on footings bearing on properly compacted fill or rock. Footings bottomed on rock or compacted fill can be designed using an allowable

bearing pressure of 3,200 psf. Footings should be at least 4 feet wide and extend at least 2 feet below lowest adjacent finish grade. A layer of compacted fill at least twice the footing width should underlay the footing. Fill should be placed and compacted as described in Section 5.1 above.

Resistance to lateral loads can be provided by passive resistance against the sides of footings and frictional resistance along the bottom of footings. Use an allowable passive pressure of 250 pounds per cubic foot (equivalent fluid pressure), and a friction coefficient of 0.35 for design.

Factors of safety for bearing capacity and lateral load resistance factors are 3.0 and 2.0 respectively; no factors of safety or scaling factors have been applied to lateral earth pressure recommendations.

5.3 Portal Exit Design Loads

A portion of the portal exit structure will extend through compacted fill. For design, use the pressures provided in Table 2 for the indicated fill thickness above the structure.

Height of Fill Above	Load per foot of Pipe	Pressure on Structure
Structure (feet)	(kips)	$(psf)^1$
3	4	650
5	9	1500
10	23	3,800
15	32	5,300
20	52	8,650

Table 2. Design Pressures on Portal Structurefor Various Heights of Compacted Fill

From NAVFAC DM-7.1, Soil Mechanics, 1982, pp. 7.1-185

¹ Pressures based on a width of 6 feet, and a soil unit weight of 130 pcf

5.4 Portal Access Road

Cutslopes resulting from grading of the portal access roads should be 1:1 or flatter. The roadway subgrade should be prepared by scarifying the upper 6 inches, moisture conditioning the scarified soils to within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction per ASTM D1557-09. If additional roadway material is necessary, it should be placed in layers 8 inches or less, and compacted as described.

6.0 References

Colorado Geological Survey, 2000, Geologic Map of the Hesperus Quadrange, La Plateau and Montezuma Counties, Colorado, Open-File 00-4.

Departments of the Army and the Air Force, 1983, *Soils And Geology, Procedures for Foundation Design of Buildings and Other Structures (Except Hydraulic Structures)*, Army TM 5-818-1, Air Force AFM 88-3, Chap. 7, October.

Gonzales, D., 2012, Personal Communication with David McLay, April 4.

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Foundations and Earth Structures, NAVFAC DM 7.1, 1982.

Terzaghi, K., Peck, R.B., 1967, Soil Mechanics in Engineering Practice, John Wiley and Sons.

Figures





Job No.: Geotech-001

Appr.:

Date: 03/16/2013

LOCATION MAP Chief Portal Mayday Idaho Mine Complex La Plata County, Colorado Figure

1







The slope above the Chief Portal. The bedrock geology supports overall stability; however, loose fill and colluvial material creates a potential for slope raveling and rock falls.



Job No.: Geotech-001

03/16/2013

Appr.:

Date:

PHOTO OF SLOPE ABOVE CHIEF PORTAL

Chief Portal Mayday Idaho Mine Complex La Plata County, Colorado Figure

3



(NOT TO SCALE)



Appendix A Test Pit and Boring Logs

Key to Boring and Test Pit Log Symbols and Abbreviations

Notes

Refer to Figure 2 for boring and test pit locations

Blow counts converted to Standard Penetration Test (split-spoon sampler) where appropriate Atterberg Limits test used to determine if soil is silt or clay, where possible.

Graphic Log descriptions included on Page 3

Abbreviations

ASTM – American Society for Testing and Materials

U.S.C.S. – Unified Soil Classification System

RWB – Roadway Boring

RWTP – Roadway Test Pit

RWBUTP – Roadway Buttress Test Pit

RWGUTP – Roadway Gabion Test Pit

TP – Test Pit Log

<u>Sampling</u>

MC – California sampler symbol

SS – Standard Penetration Test (Split Spoon sampler) symbol

AU – Auger cuttings sample symbol

GB – Grab sample

N – Blow counts per 6 inches

(N) – Blow counts per foot

<u>Testing</u>

w – Moisture Content, percent

DD – Dry Density, pounds per cubic foot

LL – Liquid Limit, PI – Plasticity Index: Atterberg Limit test results (moisture content)

UU Triaxial – unconsolidated, undrained triaxial compression test (ASTM D 2850- 03a(2007)) Compaction – modified Proctor compaction test (ASTM D 1557-09)

Group Symbol	Group Name	Group Symbol	Group Name	
GW	Well-graded gravel	SW	Well-graded sand	
GP	Poorly-graded gravel	SP	Poorly-graded sand	
GM	Silty gravel	SM	Silty sand	
GC	Clayey gravel	SC	Clayey sand	
GW-GM	Well-graded gravel with silt	SW-SM	Well-graded sand with silt	
GW-GC	Well-graded gravel with clay	SW-SC	Well-graded sand with clay	
GP-GM	Poorly-graded gravel with silt	SP-SM	Poorly-graded sand with silt	
GP-GC	Poorly-graded gravel with clay	SP-SC	Poorly-graded sand with clay	
CL	Lean clay	СН	Fat clay	
ML	Silt	MH	Elastic Silt	
OL	Organic clay/silt	ОН	Organic clay/silt	

Unified Soil Classifications (ASTM D2487-11)

Sands		Clays		
Blows per foot (N)	Relative Density	Blows per foot (N)	Consistency	
		Less than 2	Very Soft	
0-4	Very Loose	2-4	Soft	
4-10	Loose	4-8	Medium	
10-30	Medium	8-15	Stiff	
30-50	Dense	15-30	Very Stiff	
Over 50	Very Dense	Over 30	Hard	

Penetration Resistance and Soil Properties (Peck, et al)

Plasticity Chart



References

American Society for Testing and Materials, 2011. Standard Practice for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (Unified Soil Classification System). May 1.

Peck, Ralph B., *Foundation Engineering*, Second Edition, John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

SOIL CLASSIFICATION CHART

MAJOR DIVISIONS		SYMBOLS GRAPH LETTER		TYPICAL DESCRIPTIONS	
			GRAPH	LEITER	DESCRIPTIONS
	GRAVEL AND	CLEAN GRAVELS		GW	WELL-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	GRAVELLY SOILS	(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		GP	POORLY-GRADED GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND MIXTURES, LITTLE OR NO FINES
COARSE GRAINED SOILS	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE	GRAVELS WITH FINES		GM	SILTY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - SILT MIXTURES
	FRACTION RETAINED ON NO. 4 SIEVE	(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		GC	CLAYEY GRAVELS, GRAVEL - SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS	SAND AND	CLEAN SANDS		SW	WELL-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SANDS, LITTLE OR NO FINES
LARGER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE SIZE	SANDY SOILS	(LITTLE OR NO FINES)		SP	POORLY-GRADED SANDS, GRAVELLY SAND, LITTLE OR NO FINES
	MORE THAN 50% OF COARSE FRACTION	SANDS WITH FINES		SM	SILTY SANDS, SAND - SILT MIXTURES
	PASSING ON NO. 4 SIEVE	(APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF FINES)		SC	CLAYEY SANDS, SAND - CLAY MIXTURES
				ML	INORGANIC SILTS AND VERY FINE SANDS, ROCK FLOUR, SILTY OR CLAYEY FINE SANDS OR CLAYEY SILTS WITH SLIGHT PLASTICITY
FINE GRAINED SOILS	SILTS AND CLAYS	LIQUID LIMIT LESS THAN 50		CL	INORGANIC CLAYS OF LOW TO MEDIUM PLASTICITY, GRAVELLY CLAYS, SANDY CLAYS, SILTY CLAYS, LEAN CLAYS
				OL	ORGANIC SILTS AND ORGANIC SILTY CLAYS OF LOW PLASTICITY
MORE THAN 50% OF MATERIAL IS SMALLER THAN NO. 200 SIEVE				МН	INORGANIC SILTS, MICACEOUS OR DIATOMACEOUS FINE SAND OR SILTY SOILS
SIZE	SILTS AND CLAYS	LIQUID LIMIT GREATER THAN 50		СН	INORGANIC CLAYS OF HIGH PLASTICITY
				OH	ORGANIC CLAYS OF MEDIUM TO HIGH PLASTICITY, ORGANIC SILTS
HI	GHLY ORGANIC S	SOILS		PT	PEAT, HUMUS, SWAMP SOILS WITH HIGH ORGANIC CONTENTS

NOTE: DUAL SYMBOLS ARE USED TO INDICATE BORDERLINE SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS







GENERAL BH / TP / WELL - GINT STD US LAB.GDT - 4/5/12 15:55 - C:/PROGRAM FILES/GINT/PROJECTS/MAYDAY.GPJ

LIENTWildcat Mining Corporation ROJECT NUMBERGeotech-001 ATE STARTED1/27/12 COMPLETED1/27/12 CAVATION CONTRACTORWildcat Mining CCAVATION METHODExcavator DGGED BYDavid McLay, P.E CHECKED BYJ. Erich Rauber,	PROJECT NAME _ Chief Portal PROJECT LOCATION _ Hesperus, Colorado GROUND ELEVATION _ 9330.55 ft TEST PIT SIZE _4' x 5'
ATE STARTED _1/27/12 COMPLETED _1/27/12 COVATION CONTRACTOR _Wildcat Mining COVATION METHOD _Excavator	
CAVATION CONTRACTOR Wildcat Mining	GROUND ELEVATION _9330.55 ft TEST PIT SIZE _4' x 5'
CAVATION METHOD Excavator	
	AT TIME OF EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered
DTES	AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered
(#) SAMPLE TYPE SAMPLE TYPE C C C S. U LESLS C C C S.	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION
	yey sandy Gravel and Cobbles with boulders
- ^(M) GB w=10.5% GW	
4.0	9326 Bottom of test pit at 4.0 feet.

CLIENT Vikidat Mining Corporation PROJECT NAME Chief Ponal DATE STARTED COMPLETED 1/27/12 GROUND BLACKTON 3/12/12 TEST PT FISIZE 4'x9' EXCAVATION CONTRACTOR Wideat Mining GROUND BLACKTON 3/12/12 GROUND MATER LEVELS: AT TIME OF EXCAVATION	Wildcat Mining Corporation A Public Company: VRCVOB		TEST PIT NUMBER TP IARTP-03 PAGE 1 OF 1				
DATE STARTED 1/27/12 COMPLETED 1/27/12 GROUND ELEVATION 9341.23 ft TEST PIT SIZE 4' x.5' EXCAVATION CONTRACTOR Wildcat Mining GROUND WATER LEVELS: EXCAVATION METHOD Excavator AT TIME OF EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered LOGGED BY David McLay, P.E. CHECKED BY J. Erich Rauber, P.E. AT END OF EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered NOTES AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered MATERIAL DESCRIPTION 0.0 0.0 Brown sandy gravelly Cobbles and Boulders (angular) MATERIAL DESCRIPTION 2.5	CLIENT Wildcat Mining Corporation	I	PROJECT NAME Chief Portal				
EXCAVATION CONTRACTOR Wildcatt Mining GROUND WATER LEVELS: EXCAVATION METHOD Excavator AT TIME OF EXCAVATION LOGGED BY David McLay, P.E. CHECKED BY J. DOTES CHECKED BY J. Diversion AFTER EXCAVATION MATERIAL DESCRIPTION Brown sandy gravelly Cobbles and Boulders (angular)	PROJECT NUMBER Geotech-001		PROJECT LOCATION Hesperus, Colorado				
EXCAVATION METHOD Excavator LOGGED BY David McLay, P.E. CHECKED BY J. Erich Rauber, P.E. AT TIME OF EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered MATERIAL DESCRIPTION Brown sandy gravelly Cobbles and Boulders (angular)	DATE STARTED 1/27/12	COMPLETED <u>1/27/12</u>	GROUND ELEVATION _9341.23 ft TEST PIT SIZE _4' x 5'				
LOGGED BY David McLay, P.E. CHECKED BY J. Erich Rauber, P.E. AT END OF EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered NOTES	EXCAVATION CONTRACTOR Wild	dcat Mining	GROUND WATER LEVELS:				
NOTES AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered Hage Water and the second se	EXCAVATION METHOD Excavator						
Head Waterial Description 0.0 Image: Signal		CHECKED BY J. Erich Rauber, P.I					
0.0 Brown sandy gravelly Cobbles and Boulders (angular) 2.5 - 4.0 93	NOTES		AFTER EXCAVATION No Free Water Encountered				
$ \begin{array}{c} - & - \\ - & - \\ $	0.0						
		Brown sandy gravelly Cobbles and Bould	lers (angular)				
	4.0		933 Bottom of test pit at 4.0 feet.				

Appendix B Laboratory Report

Geotechnical Investigation Boring and Test Pit Laboratory Testing Summary

Chief Portal Geotechnical Investigation

May Day Idaho Mine Complex, La Plata County, Colorado

					UU			Compaction			
	Depth	Sample	Moisture	Dry Unit	Triaxial	Atterbe	rg Limits	Rock Co	rrected	Uncorr	ected
Location (1)	(feet)	Type (2)	Content %	Weight, pcf	Compression	LL %	PI %	MMD, pcf	OMC, %	MMD, pcf	OMC, %
CPTP-01 (3)	1.0-2.0	Baggie	15.1			25	10	139.6	5.8	130.9	7.8
CPTP-02	1.0-2.0	Baggie	12.1								
IARTP-01	1.5-2.5	Bulk	14.5								
IARTP-02	1.5-3.0	Baggie	10.5								

<u>Notes</u>

1. See Figure 2 for boring and test pit locations.

2. Sample Types: Baggie-sealable plastic bag, Bulk-5-gallon sealable plastic bucket, Liner-brass liner for California Sampler

3. See Attached Moisture-Density Curve (Proctor) Report

SD - Sample disturbed

pcf - pounds per cubic foot

% - percent

LL-Liquid Limit; PI-Plasticity Index

MMD - Maximum Dry Density; OMC - Optimum Moisture Content

LABORATORY COMPACTION CHARACTERISTICS OF SOIL REPORT

Report Number: 69121002.0003 Service Date: 02/13/12 **Report Date:** 02/17/12

Wildcat Mining Corporation

Attn: David McLay

5555 DTC Parkway

Suite A-4000



Project

Wildcat Mining/Laboratory Testing Services Laboratory Flora Vista, NM 87415

01/31/12

Client

Project Number 69121002

Material Information

Client

Source of Material: CPTP-01 **Proposed Use:**

Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Sample Information

Sample Date: Sampled By: **Sample Location:**

Sample Time: 1440 CPTP-01 @ 0-1.5'

Sample Description:

Laboratory Test Data	a			Result	Specifications		
Test Procedure: AS	STM D1557	7	Liquid Limit:	25			
Test Method: M	ethod C		Plastic Limit:	15			
Sample Preparation: W	'et		Plasticity Index:	10			
	echanical		In-Place Moisture (%):	15.1			
			Passing 3/4" (%):	70.0			
			Passing #4 (%):	55.0			
			USCS:	22.0			
Oversized Particles (%):		30.0	Zero Air	Voids Curve for	Assumed Specific		
Moisture (%):		1.0		Gravity 2			
Sieve for Oversize Fraction	on:	3/4					
Assumed Bulk Specific G	Fravity		d 140 139 tu 138				
of Oversized Particles:	·	2.65	Line (j)				
Corrected for Oversized	Particles (A	ASTM D4718)	X 135				
Maximum Dry Unit Weig	ght (pcf):	139.6					
Optimum Water Content	t (%):	5.8					
Uncorrected Values			1 2	3 4 5	6 7 8 9 10		
Maximum Dry Unit Weig	Maximum Dry Unit Weight (pcf): 130.9		Water Content (%)				
Optimum Water Content	t (%):	7.8		water Co	interit (70)		
Comments: Performed test Mexico labora	e ,	ples provided by Mr. Da	ave McLay with Wildcat Mining Co	rporation to our	r Flora Vista, New		
Somulass Mall Cal Day	1		$(A \operatorname{CTM} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{A} 2 1 0) = 1 \mathbf{M} \cdot 1 \mathbf{M}$		102210		

Services: Modified Proctor Test (ASTM 1557), Attergerg Limits (ASTM D4318) and Moisture Content (ASTM D2216)

Terracon Rep.: Client **Reported To: Contractor: Report Distribution:**

(1) Wildcat Mining Corporation

(1) Terracon Consultants, Inc.

Reviewed By:

Izra C. A. In

Zachary St Jean Department Manager II-Professional

Test Methods: ASTM D1557

The tests were performed in general accordance with applicable ASTM, AASHTO, or DOT test methods. This report is exclusively for the use of the client indicated above and shall not be reproduced except in full without the written consent of our company. Test results transmitted herein are only applicable to the actual samples tested at the location(s) referenced and are not necessarily indicative of the properties of other apparently similar or identical materials. CR0006, 8-27-11, Rev.6 Page 1 of 1