

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE:July 25, 2018PROJECT #: 605.8206TO:Victoria Peacey, Resolution CopperFROM:Derek Groenendyk and Tim BayleyPROJECT:Near West Tailings FacilityFacilitySUBJECT:Alternatives 2 and 3 Steady-State ModelingFacility

Introduction

At the request of Resolution Copper (RC), Montgomery & Associates (M&A) has prepared this technical memorandum to support the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) being prepared by the United States Forest Service as part of the ongoing National Environmental Policy Act review process for the Resolution Project near Superior, Arizona. The DEIS for the proposed Resolution Copper mine includes the following tailings storage facility alternatives:

- Alternative 2: Near West Modified Proposed Action (Modified Centerline Embankment "Wet")
- Alternative 3: Near West Modified Proposed Action (High-density Thickened Non Pyrite Acid Generating (NPAG) Scavenger Tailings and Segregated Pyrite Acid Generating (PAG) Pyrite Tailings Cell "Dry")
- Alternative 4: Silver King Filtered
- Alternative 5: Peg Leg Optimized
- Alternative 6: Skunk Camp

This memorandum was written to document model construction and results of steady-state groundwater flow modeling (Model) of the proposed Near West Tailings Storage Facility (TSF). The Model was prepared to provide estimates of TSF seepage rates and travel times for Alternatives 2 and 3 in support of GoldSim contaminant transport modeling. The site of the proposed TSF is in the Superior Basin, which is in the upper Queen Creek watershed, from its headwaters to Whitlow Ranch Dam (**Figure 1**).

The Model was developed in MODFLOW-USG (Panday and others, 2013) to provide estimates of seepage rates into the three drainages adjacent to the TSF footprint (Potts and



Roblas Canyon, and Queen Creek) and travel times from the TSF to these drainages during maximum build out conditions. The engineering and design of the TSF are documented in design reports by Klohn Crippen Berger Ltd. (KCB) (KCB, 2018 a,b). The Model is intended to be a simplified representation of both natural hydrogeologic conditions and engineered tailings conditions. While the seepage rates and travel times derived from this Model are considered to be useful tools for TSF alternatives comparison, it is important to recognize that several conservative assumptions are built into the Model. Specifically, the Model represents steady-state conditions assuming operational conditions at full TSF build out. The hydraulic gradients developed under the modeled conditions are expected to be steeper than would occur during the actual transient build out of the mine, likely resulting in an overestimate of seepage rates. In addition, these steeper gradients would result in shorter travel times than would be likely to occur during transient mine build out.

Model Layering & Geometry

The Model was developed with fourteen layers representing the constructed TSF and natural subsurface (**Table 1**). Layers one through seven represent tailings and are only active where the TSF is present. Layer seven includes a blanket drain under the proposed extent of the TSF embankment. Model cells in layers one through seven are active based on the vertical and horizontal extent of the TSF at the end of mining operations. Layer eight is the uppermost layer below the natural ground surface, and represents land surface. Layer eight also contains finger drains where they are present under the TSF. Layers nine through fourteen represent the remainder of the subsurface to a depth of 650 feet below land surface.

Alluvium in the Model was separated into two units, one representing Queen Creek and the other representing the tributaries of Queen Creek in the basin. Alluvial tributaries within the TSF footprint are assumed to be filled with tailings material where finger drains are not present. The Queen Creek alluvium varies in thickness from 10 to 50 feet and is present in model layers eight and nine. Tributary alluvium is considered to be 10 feet thick and is present only in layer eight. **Table 1** provides detailed information on model layering and thickness. Values shown in **Table 1** represent model cell thickness in feet.



Table 1. Model Layering

			Outside TSF			Tailings Storage Facility			
Model	Represents				No Finger Drains		Finger Drains		
Layer		Bedrock	Tributary Alluvum	Queen Creek Alluvium	Tailings only	Excavated Tributary Alluvium	Tailings only	Excavated Tributary Alluvium	
1					100	100	100	100	
2					100	100	100	100	
3	Outside TSF: inactive				100	100	100	100	
4	Inside TSF: tailings				100	100	100	100	
5					100	100	100	100	
6					97	97	97	97	
7	Outside TSF: inactive Inside TSF: blanket drain or tailings				3	3	3	3	
8	Outside TSF: 10 feet bedrock or 10 to 49 feet alluvium Inside TSF: finger drains or bedrock	10	10	10 to 49	10	10	10	10	
9	Outside TSF: 30 feet bedrock or 30 to 1 feet alluvium Inside TSF: bedrock	30	30	30 to 1	30	30	30	30	
10	Bedrock	30	30	30 to 20	30	30	30	30	
11	Bedrock	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	
12	Bedrock	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	
13	Bedrock	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	
14	Bedrock	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	
Inactive Land surface									

Model grid cells in the area of the TSF are 100×100 feet; outside the area of the TSF, model cells are 500 x 500 feet (**Figure 2**). Model layering was based on the original, pre-TSF land surface. The land surface elevation for each model cell is calculated as the spatially-weighted average of a 22.5 x 22.5 feet Digital Elevation Model of the area.

Model Domain and Boundary Conditions

Blanket drain; tailings where no blanket drain is present

Tailings Finger drains Native bedrock

The model domain is shown on **Figure 2** and extends to the Superior Basin boundary in the northwest and northeast, the Queen Creek alluvium in the south and southwest, and the Happy Camp drainage in the southeast. Model boundaries to the north, west, and northeast are represented as no-flow boundaries. The southeastern model boundary is approximately perpendicular to observed groundwater flow contours (M&A, 2017a) along the Happy Camp drainage and was simulated as a no-flow boundary. The south/southwestern boundary of the Model is the southern extent of the Queen Creek alluvial deposits. A specified-flux boundary was used to simulate 319 acre-feet per year (AF/yr) of groundwater underflow entering the model domain from the south side of Queen Creek as determined in the Superior Basin Conceptual Model (M&A, 2017a). This specified-flux boundary was implemented using the MODFLOW WEL package.



Hydrogeology

The geologic setting of the proposed TSF site is complex including many rock types and a series faulted and tilted structural features. The principal Hydrogeologic Units (HGUs) identified in the study area include (in order of increasing age): Quaternary alluvial deposits, Tertiary Gila Conglomerate, Tertiary sandstone, younger Tertiary volcanic rocks, Tertiary Apache Leap Tuff, older Tertiary volcanic rocks, Tertiary Whitetail Conglomerate, Tertiary-Cretaceous intrusive igneous rocks, Paleozoic sedimentary rocks, younger Precambrian intrusive igneous rocks, younger Precambrian sedimentary, older Precambrian intrusive igneous rocks, and older Precambrian metamorphic rocks. Additional description of the geologic setting of the TSF foundation is provided in the following reports:

Hydrogeologic studies of the Near West tailings site include:

- Near West Tailings Storage Facility Pre-Feasibility Study: Geotechnical Site Characterization Report, KCB, 2017
- Construction, Development, & Testing of Hydrologic Test Wells in Support of the Near West Tailings Prefeasibility Study, M&A, 2017b
- Near West TSF Geotechnical Site Characterization Report, Golder Associates, 2017 Conceptual Hydrogeologic Model for Proposed Near West Tailings Storage Facility, M&A, 2017a

Hydraulic Properties

Numerous hydraulic tests were conducted to determine the hydraulic properties of the geologic units.

Testing conducted at the TSF site and documented by M&A (2017a) includes:

- Packer tests and falling head tests in 38 open boreholes
- Constant-rate pumping tests in eight (8) hydrologic test wells
- Short-duration pumping tests in four (4) geotechnical piezometers and one (1) hydrologic test well
- Slug tests in eight (8) hydrologic test wells and four (4) piezometers
- Downhole nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) geophysical logging.

Measured hydraulic conductivity values near the TSF range from 4.0×10^{-5} feet per day (ft/d) in the Diabase to over 1,000 ft/d in the Queen Creek alluvium. However, for the



purpose of this simplified modeling study, a single homogenous isotropic material was used to represent the bedrock units. Homogenous isotropic materials with differing hydraulic conductivities were also used to represent the tributary and Queen Creek alluvium, drain, and tailing units (**Table 2**).

The representative hydraulic conductivity of the bedrock was determined to be 1.32×10^{-2} ft/d, by calculating the volume-weighted geometric mean of the HGUs present in the subsurface (M&A, 2017c). Aquifer testing indicated that the hydraulic conductivity of the Queen Creek alluvium was much higher than the surrounding bedrock; the Model uses a value of 1,000 ft/d (M&A, 2017a). The tributary alluvium has a hydraulic conductivity of 500 ft/d in the Model.

Tailings material is represented as a homogeneous, isotropic material with a hydraulic conductivity of 2.83×10^{-2} ft/d which is the expected composite hydraulic conductivity of the scavenger beach. The blanket drain is represented with a homogeneous isotropic highly conductive gravel material, with a hydraulic conductivity of 142 ft/d. Finger drains are also represented by a homogeneous isotropic highly conductive gravel material, with a hydraulic conductive gravel material hydraulic conductive grav

Material Type	<i>K</i> ℎ (ft/d)
Bedrock	1.32 x 10 ⁻²
Scavenger Composite Beach Tailings	2.83 x 10 ⁻²
Finger drain	283
Blanket drain	142
Queen Creek Alluvium	1,000
Tributary Alluvium	500

Table 2. Hydraulic Properties

TSF Engineering Features

This Model includes TSF engineering features that are considered necessary for geotechnical stability of the TSF, which includes a blanket drain, a network of finger drains, and seepage collection dams with pump back wells in drainage channels that drain the footprint of the TSF (**Figure 3**). Full design details of these structures is presented by KCB (2018a,b).

The blanket drain is designed to be a 3-foot thick, highly conductive layer consisting of coarse gravel that drains the embankment of the TSF. The blanket drain is located in model layer seven (a 3-foot thick layer) beneath the complete extent of embankment and is represented by a high hydraulic conductivity (142 ft/d). Discharge from the blanket drain



to the perimeter of the embankment reports to a MODFLOW Drain Cell (DRN), and exits the simulated flow system. In reality, discharge from the blanket drain would emerge at land surface and flow through lined channels along the embankment toe to the finger drains before reaching the seepage collection dams; however, this surface flow is not being simulated. The stage of the DRNs at the perimeter of the embankment are equal to the elevation of the bottom of layer seven, with a drain conductance of 1×10^6 square feet per day (ft²/d).

Finger drains are designed as 10 feet thick by 30 feet wide channels filled with highly conductive coarse gravel excavated into existing alluvial channels under the TSF. Finger drains are located in model layer eight beneath the blanket drain and extend to the perimeter of the embankment in the model. Flow in the finger drains reports to simulated DRNs at the downstream end, and exits the simulated flow system. As is the case with the blanket drains, in reality, discharge from the finger drains would result in surface flow that reports to the seepage collection dams through lined channels but is not explicitly simulated. The stage of the DRNs at the end of the finger drains is equal to the elevation of the bottom of the layer eight, with a drain conductance of 1×10^6 ft²/d.

The primary seepage collection dams are designed as general fill dams covered on the upstream side with a geomembrane placed in excavated alluvium downstream of the TSF to capture seepage from the finger drains. They will include a grouted cut-off wall that extends into the subsurface below and a well on the upstream side to pump seepage back onto the TSF. The cut-off walls beneath each seepage collection dam are simulated using MODFLOW's Horizontal Flow Barrier (HFB) package. The cut-off walls are only in alluvium cells in model layer eight where seepage collection dams are present. The cut-off walls have a thickness of 3 feet, a depth of 10 feet, a width of 100 feet (covering the entire downstream cross-sectional area of the cell), and a hydraulic conductivity of 2.83×10^{-3} ft/d. Pump back wells are represented with DRN cells located upgradient from the cut-off walls in layer eight. The DRNs have a stage equal to the bottom elevation of the cell, with a drain conductance of 1×10^6 ft²/d. Water that enters these drain cells exits the simulated system.

Model Inputs and Outputs

A complete water balance of the model domain is provided in M&A (2017a). This memorandum summarizes the model domain water balance and describes its translation into the steady-state numerical model.



Inflows

Estimated recharge for the model domain was calculated using the approach outlined by Anderson and others (1992) to be 676 AF/yr (M&A, 2017a). When converted to percent of precipitation, the estimated recharge was 1.5% of precipitation. This is consistent with other regional aquifer recharge studies (Osterkamp, 1973; Freethey and Anderson, 1986; Woodhouse, 1997).

Recharge to groundwater was partitioned between diffuse recharge occurring through bedrock infiltration and focused recharge along streambeds. Based on Meixner and others (2016), 25% of the recharge was assigned to bedrock areas of the model, 75% was assigned to alluvial drainages.

Subflow in the Queen Creek alluvial channel at the southeastern model boundary was estimated to be 42 AF/yr using Darcy's Law (M&A, 2017a). This inflow was represented in the model using MODFLOW's well (WEL) package. The flux is applied to model layer eight.

Groundwater underflow enters the model domain from the southwest at the boundary between the Queen Creek Alluvium and the bedrock immediately to the south. Groundwater inflow from the south is estimated to be 319 AF/yr based on a water balance of the Superior Basin (M&A, 2017a).

TSF Recharge

Recharge during active deposition on the tailings was estimated by KCB using a 1D unsaturated numerical water flow model (**Table 5**) (KCB, 2018a,b). The rate of recharge applied to the TSF at maximum buildout is 2.29×10^{-3} ft/d for Alternative 2 and 6.17×10^{-4} ft/d for Alternative 3. These rates represent the net rate of water applied to the TSF during buildout taking into account precipitation, evaporation, and runoff. Recharge in the TSF is added through MODFLOW's well (WEL) package. The wells have an injection rate equal to the rate of applied water (ft/d) x cell area (ft²).

Model cells representing cleaner tailings covered by ponds have an injection rate based on the unit gradient conditions for consolidated cleaner tailings material, which has a vertical hydraulic conductivity of 7.08×10^{-4} ft/d. The location and extent of the ponded cleaner tailings changes throughout the duration of TSF construction. The cleaner tailings cells in the Model used to represent the area of ponded recharge for both Alternatives 2 and 3 are based on the tailings buildout from the KCB design for Alternative 2 (2018a). The representative cells cover an area near the maximum extent of the ponded area and are



located near the center of the TSF footprint, which occurs approximately 25 years after the start of mining operations in Alternative 2 (**Figure 3**).

	Alternativ	ve 2	Alternative 3		
	Scavenger Beach Cleaner Tailings Tailings		Scavenger Beach	Cleaner Tailings	
			Tailings		
Recharge (gpm/acre)	0.52	0.160	0.14	0.160	
Recharge (AF/yr)	1,912	220	508	220	

Table 3. Recharge Applied to TSF

gpm = gallons per minute

Outflows

Very little groundwater development has occurred within the model domain. Approximately 1.3 miles southeast of the proposed TSF, there is an irrigation well, Arizona Department of Water Resources 55-627523, that is estimated to pump 5 AF of groundwater per year (M&A, 2017a) and is included in the Model. Several small windmill and solar ranch wells exist within the model domain; however, their groundwater abstraction is considered to be negligible. There are no other known significant point withdrawals within the study area.

Groundwater also leaves the system through groundwater evapotranspiration (GET) which primarily occurs in alluvial drainage channels. A total annual GET rate of 305 AF/yr was estimated for the study area (M&A, 2017a). GET is represented using MODFLOW's WEL package. GET was distributed uniformly across the alluvium in layer ten to provide stability in the Model (**Figure 2**). Simulated GET rates are scaled based on the size of the model cell. Cells with dimensions of 100 x 100 feet are assigned a GET rate of 1.8 ft³/d and cells with dimensions of 500 x 500 feet are assigned a GET rate of 44.9 ft³/d. Groundwater evaporation is assumed to only occur outside the footprint of the TSF.

Surface water flow in Queen Creek at Whitlow Ranch Dam comprises the most significant outflow in the system. Bedrock (Apache Leap Tuff) forces groundwater to the surface in this location and is conceptualized as the exit point for all groundwater and surface water in the Superior Basin. Groundwater reporting to the surface upstream from the dam exits the basin through a culvert in the dam as surface water. Baseflow rates for Queen Creek at Whitlow Ranch Dam were estimated using a Delta Filter analysis. An assessment of 16 years of daily baseflow in Queen Creek at Whitlow Ranch Dam suggests a median baseflow rate (groundwater outflow) of approximately 794 AF/yr (M&A, 2017a).



Water Balance

A complete water balance of the Superior Basin can be found in the Conceptual Hydrogeologic Model for Proposed Near West Tailings Storage Facility report (M&A, 2017). The areal recharge over the footprint of the TSF made up 63 AF/yr of the total natural recharge. When removed, the areal recharge outside the TSF is equal to 613 AF/year. The models for Alternatives 2 and 3 have natural recharge outside the TSF of 613 AF/yr, recharge along the southern boundary of Queen Creek of 319 AF/yr, and subflow entering Queen Creek of 42 AF/yr.

TSF recharge for the scavenger beach tailings have recharge rates that vary based on the model alternative. For Alternative 2 the scavenger beach tailings recharge rate is 1,912 AF/yr and cleaner tailings recharge rate of 220 AF/yr and for Alternative 3 the recharge rates are 508 AF/yr for the scavenger beach tailings and 220 AF/yr for the cleaner tailings.

Drains in and surrounding the TSF capture 1,935 AF/yr or 91% of the TSF recharge in Alternative 2 and 610 AF/yr or 84% of the TSF recharge in Alternative 3. Seepage out of the TSF that is not captured by the drains for Alternative 2 is 197 AF/yr and 118 AF/yr for Alternative 3. The baseflow at Whitlow Ranch Dam increases by 152 AF/yr to 946 AF/yr for Alternative 2 and by 73 AF/yr to 867 AF/yr for Alternative 3. The total GET for the Model for both alternatives is 216 AF/yr. The complete water balance for Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 can be found in **Table 4**.

	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	
	acre-feet	acre-feet	
ANNUAL INFLOWS	3,106	1,702	
TSF Recharge	2,132	728	
Natural Recharge	613	613	
Underflow into Model Domain	319	319	
Queen Creek Subflow	42	42	
ANNUAL OUTFLOWS	3,106	1,704	
Embankment Drains	845	174	
Finger Drains	1,090	436	
Seepage Collection Dams	7	4	
Groundwater ET	216	216	
Well Withdrawals	5	5	
Whitlow Ranch Dam Flow	946	867	
Error	0	-2	

Table 4. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 Water Balance



Solute Transport Parameters

This Model is not intended to represent solute transport and does not provide solute transport results. The intent of this Model is to determine how much TSF seepage water enters each of the three alluvial channels surrounding the TSF (Potts Canyon, Roblas Canyon, and Queen Creek). However, the MODFLOW-USG transport package was used as a tool to determine the portion of water that originates from the TSF and enters Potts Canyon, Roblas Canyon, and Queen Creek.

Tailings water was added to the transport model using a unit (1) concentration. By running the Model in this way, the average concentration of water in the aquifer subdomains representing the alluvial channel is equal to the percent of flow in the subdomain that was sourced from TSF seepage. Transport is simulated using the steady-state flow field until concentrations were constant through transport model time.

Porosity values were estimated from specific yield results from pumping tests and NMR logs (M&A, 2017a), or were taken from the literature. Porosities assigned to HGUs are listed in **Table 5**.

Longitudinal dispersivity of 30 feet was used based on Ayra (1986) having a field scale on the order of 2,300 feet (the shortest distance between the toe of the TSF and Queen Creek). This is consistent with the value provided by the Xu and Eckstein (1995) equation and is also in the lower half of the range of dispersivities in Gelhar and others, (1992). The transverse dispersivity was 3 feet; one order-of-magnitude smaller than the longitudinal dispersivity.

Table 5. Porosity

Material Type	Porosity
Bedrock	0.042
Scavenger Composite Beach Tailings	0.35
Finger drain	0.15
Blanket drain	0.15
Queen Creek Alluvium	0.16
Tributary Alluvium	0.16



Results

Flow Rates

The results from this Model are being used to provide estimates of TSF seepage rates for the GoldSim contaminant transport modeling being done for Alternatives 2 and 3. The major pathways for seepage to leave the TSF and travel downstream to Whitlow Ranch Dam via Queen Creek are through Roblas Canyon, Potts Canyon, and a portion of Queen Creek adjacent to the TSF. Potts and Roblas Canyons are southeast and northwest of the TSF respectively and flow into Queen Creek.

The spatial extents of the aquifer subdomains used to determine flow and concentration are shown on **Figure 4**. The amount of seepage from the TSF that enters Potts Canyon, Roblas Canyon, and Queen Creek immediately adjacent to the TSF for Alternatives 2 and 3 is presented in **Table 6**. Total seepage represents the total contribution of flow to Queen Creek sourced from the TSF and is equal to the increase in flow at Whitlow Ranch Dam.

Table 6. Seepage into Alluvium

Aquifer subdomain	Alterna	ative 2	Alternative 3		
	AF/yr	gpm	AF/yr	gpm	
Roblas Canyon	32	20	12	7	
Potts Canyon	68	42	27	17	
Queen Creek	52	32	34	21	
Total Seepage	152	94	73	45	

Travel Times

The GoldSim contaminant transport models being developed for Alternatives 2 and 3 only model flow through the alluvium. However, seepage must travel from the TSF foundation through the bedrock units before entering the alluvium. Because of the irregular geometry and the fact that the driving hydraulic gradient is based on hydraulic head differences between the TSF and the surrounding rock, this calculation requires outputs from this model.

Transit time for seepage to enter the drainages was calculated based on the modeled groundwater gradient and hydraulic properties of the subsurface between the crest of the embankment on the TSF and respective drainage. Because this steady-state calculation represents full TSF buildout conditions, this calculation is considered conservative and



may underestimate travel times during transient TSF buildout. The drainages are represented by the domains on **Figures 4 and 5**, for Alternatives 2 and 3 respectively.

The equation used to calculate transit time, *t*, is as follows:

$$t=\frac{D}{v}$$

Where D is the distance from the crest of the water table in the TSF to the drainage and v the flow velocity which is calculated as:

$$v = \frac{K}{n} \frac{dh}{dl}$$

Where *K* is the hydraulic conductivity, *n* the porosity, *dh* difference in head between the embankment of the TSF and drainage, *dl* the distance between the locations of head values used (here, equal to *D*) (Freeze & Cherry, 1979).

Contours of groundwater elevations for Alternative 2 used to calculate transit time are shown on **Figure 4** and the contours for Alternative 3 are shown on **Figure 5**. The hydraulic conductivity and porosity values used for each drainage were estimated to be the spatially weighted average of the geologic units in the uppermost 100 feet of the area between the TSF and the drainage. The average gradient along each drainage was used to calculate the transit time for seepage leaving the TSF and entering the drainage. The specific values used for all quantities including the calculated transit times are listed in **Tables 7 and 8** for Alternatives 2 and 3, respectively.

Aquifer subdomain	K	n	dh	dl	dh/dl	t
	ft/day		feet	feet		years
Roblas Canyon	0.0354	0.0450	466	3,510	0.133	92
Potts Canyon	0.0304	0.0176	321	2,860	0.112	40
Queen Creek	0.0750	0.0482	584	4,250	0.137	54

Table 7. Transit Time Alternative 2

Table 8. Transit Time Alternative 3

Aquifer subdomain	K	n	dh	dl	dh/dl	t
	ft/day		feet	feet		years
Roblas Canyon	0.0354	0.0450	197	3,510	0.0561	218
Potts Canyon	0.0304	0.0176	137	2,850	0.0481	93
Queen Creek	0.0750	0.0482	256	4,250	0.0602	124



References

- Anderson, T.W., G.W. Freethey, and P. Tucci, 1992, Geohydrology and Water Resources of Alluvial Basins in South-Central Arizona and Parts of Adjacent States: U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 1406-B, 1992.
- Arya, A, 1986, Dispersion and Reservoir Heterogeneity, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- Freethey, G.W. and T.W. Anderson, 1986, Predevelopment Hydrologic Conditions in the Alluvial Basins of Arizona and Adjacent Parts of California and New Mexico: Hydrologic Investigations Atlas HA-664, 1986.
- Freeze, R. A., J. A. Cherry, 1979, Groundwater. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gelhar, L.W., A. Mantologu, C. Welty, and K.R. Rehfeldt, 1992, A Critical Review of Data on Field-Scale Dispersion in Aquifers: Water Resources Research, Vol. 28, No. 7, pp 1955-1974.
- Golder Associates, 2017, Near West TSF Geotechnical Investigation Field Summary Report: Submitted to Resolution Copper Mining LLC, March 27, 2017.
- Klohn Crippen Berger Ltd. (KCB), 2018a, Resolution Project DEIS Design for Alternative 3A - Near West Modified Proposed Action (Modified Centerline Embankment - "wet") - Doc. # CCC.03-26000-EX-REP-00002, April 2018.
 - ____, 2018b, Resolution Project DEIS Design for Alternative 3B Near West Modified Proposed Action (High-density thickened NPAG Scavenger and Segregated PAG Pyrite Cell) - Doc. # CCC.03-26000-EX-REP-00005, April 2018.
- _____, 2017, Near West Tailings Storage Facility Pre-Feasibility Study: Geotechnical Site Characterization Report, September 15, 2017.
- Meixner, T., A. Manning, D. Stonestrom, D. Allen, H. Ajami, K. Blasch, A. Brookfeld,
 C. Castro, J. Clark, D. Gochis, A. Flint, K. Neff, R. Niraula, M. Rodell, B. Scanlon,
 K. Singha, and M. Walvoord, 2016, Implications of Projected Climate Change for
 Groundwater Recharge in the Western United States, Journal of Hydrology,
 Vol. 534, pp. 124-138.
- Montgomery & Associates, 2017a, Conceptual Hydrogeologic Model for Proposed Near West Tailings Storage Facility: November 2017.



- _____, 2017b, Construction, Development, & Testing of Hydrologic Test Wells in Support of the Near West Tailings Prefeasibility Study: October 2017.
- _____, 2017c, Datasets and Assumptions for the Near West Leapfrog Geologic Model: Technical Memorandum prepared for Resolution Copper Mining LLC, July 18, 2017.
- Osterkamp, W.R., 1973, Ground-water recharge in the Tucson area, Arizona: U.S. Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Investigation Series Map I-844-E, 1 sheet.
- Panday, Sorab, Langevin, C.D., Niswonger, R.G., Ibaraki, Motomu, and Hughes, J.D., 2013, MODFLOW–USG version 1: An unstructured grid version of MODFLOW for simulating groundwater flow and tightly coupled processes using a control volume finite-difference formulation: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods, book 6, chap. A45, 66 p.
- Woodhouse, E. G., 1997, Perched water in fractured, welded tuff: mechanisms of formation and characteristics of recharge: Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Xu, Moujin and Eckstein, Yoram, 1995, Use of Weighted Least-Squared Method in Evaluation of the Relationship between Dispersivity and Field Scale: Ground Water, Vol. 33, No. 6, pp 905-908.



G:\GIS-Tuc\Projects\605\605.8206\Alt 2 and 3\Figure 1_Location Map_Alt2_3.mxd \ 25July2018





G:\GIS-Tuc\Projects\605\605.8206\Alt3_3DSteadyState\NearWest_3DSteadyState_Figures_v1.qgs



G:\GIS-Tuc\Projects\605\605.8206\Alt3_3DSteadyState\NearWest_3DSteadyState_Figures_v1.qgs



G:\GIS-Tuc\Projects\605\605.8206\Alt3_3DSteadyState\NearWest_3DSteadyState_Figures_v1.qgs





G:\GIS-Tuc\Projects\605\605.8206\Alt3_3DSteadyState\NearWest_3DSteadyState_Figures_v1.qgs

