



Sound Science. Creative Solutions.

Phoenix Office
3033 North Central Avenue, Suite 145
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Tel 602.274.3831 Fax 602.274.3958
www.swca.com

February 12, 2010

Mr. Jamie Sturgess
Augusta Resource Corporation
4500 Cherry Creek South Drive
Denver, Colorado 80246-1548

Re: Contract Modification for Year 2010 Services Relating to the Rosemont Copper Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Dear Jamie:

Per our meeting on December 22, 2009, enclosed is a request for our proposed 2010 Scope of Work and estimated cost for NEPA services relating to the Rosemont Copper Project. This scope represents our estimate at this time to complete the Draft EIS (DEIS). This request is consistent with the terms in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and subsequent amendments, between Rosemont Copper Company (RCC) and the Coronado National Forest (CNF). The attached scope is intended to anticipate work/support we believe the CNF will require to prepare a DEIS with six alternatives (including the No Action).

SWCA has also committed to, and begun executing, the schedule of monthly Drafts submitted to the CNF. As you know, we submitted the second Draft to the CNF on January 15 and are on track to submit a substantially improved Draft on February 16. This required SWCA to move money allocated from Task 3 (Administrative Record) and other tasks with positive balances to other tasks to prevent an interruption in work (as approved by during our December 22, 2009 meeting in Phoenix, AZ). It also required us to spend monies beyond that 2009 authorization; monies that are proposed in this document. Therefore, time is of the essence with regards to authorizing this agreement.

We have retained the list of Tasks from the 2009 Scope for consistency. In some cases, the Tasks are complete and no further work is anticipated. This is noted in the appropriate section. This scope is intended to result in the completion of a DEIS and a Public Participation Plan for public comment. This cost estimate covers specified work that will be completed by June 1, 2010. No cost estimate is provided for SWCA's participation in the public comment period at this time because the Coronado has yet to determine the level of effort required and logistical support they will request from SWCA. The attached Scope does not include response to public comment because the Coronado has indicated that they intend to contract a Forest Service Enterprise Team to complete that task. Additionally this proposal does not

include any cost to editing this document past the compilation of the DEIS (i.e. incorporating public comments and publication of the FEIS). We look forward to continuing our work on this project and a successful publication of a DEIS.

Per RCC's request from the December 22, 2009 meeting, SWCA will submit monthly invoices with the charges being allocated to one of six specific deliverables.

| | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|
| 11204-06 | January 15, 2010 Draft deliverable |
| 11204-07 | February 16, 2010 Draft deliverable |
| 11204-08 | March 22, 2010 Draft deliverable |
| 11204-09 | Administrative Record |
| 11204-10 | Public Participation Plan |
| 11204-11 | Additional CNF Requests |

As per our previous contract this will be a fixed fee contract with invoices sent monthly. The Additional CNF Requests will be a Time and Materials based task.

Sincerely,



Ken Houser
Managing Principal

cc: T. Furgason, SWCA
Project file 11204.02, Task 1

Attachments: Scope of Work
2010 SWCA Billing Rates

SCOPE OF WORK

For NEPA Services to be provided in 2010 in support of the Rosemont Copper Project EIS

TASK 1. MANAGEMENT OF THE NEPA PROCESS

OBJECTIVE: Task 1 is intended to establish milestones within the NEPA process. These milestones do not necessarily result in deliverables; however, they will be tracked in the attached Table titled "NEPA Process Status Report". This task will manage the quality and 2009 schedule of the overall Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) project; manage project teams; monitor goals and milestones; and monitor SWCA and Forest Service responsibilities, reporting procedures, communication plans, and information gathering responsibilities.

Deliverables for this task will include such things as agendas and notes documenting each meeting, list of action items from each meeting, submission of monthly tracking sheets, and documentation of involvement of Cooperating Agencies

Task 1.1. Weekly Project Status Meetings

SWCA will coordinate weekly with the USFS to maintain tight control of the project's schedule, strategic direction and progress through the use of a Project Core Team (PCT). The PCT meetings, which may also be conference calls, will serve to maintain the project's focus and a realistic schedule. Meeting topics will include a discussion of current tasks, progress, and direction. Key issues or anticipated issues that have the potential to affect the schedule will also be discussed. The PCT will consist of the Forest Service Project Manager and ID Team Leaders and the SWCA Project Manager and/or Assistant Project Manager. Other key Team members will be invited as appropriate for each meeting/conference call to discuss specific project issues.

Assumptions:

- No more than 24 meetings between Jan 1st and the publication of the DEIS with two SWCA staff attending.

Task 1.2. Monthly Proponent Status Meetings

Monthly meetings will be attended with Rosemont Copper Company (RCC), USFS, and SWCA throughout the EIS process. Meetings will be held in person to discuss progress and resolve data requests. It is anticipated that all meetings will occur at the Forest Supervisor's Office in Tucson Arizona. This meeting will include a review of SWCA's progress on completing milestones.

Assumptions:

- 10 monthly meetings with one SWCA staff as deemed appropriate for the planned content of the meeting.

Task 1.3. Other Meetings

These may include meetings not elsewhere identified in this scope that are called by the USFWS, USFS, SWCA, RCC or other project consultants.

Assumptions:

- Five unscheduled meetings to be held at CNF offices or SWCA Tucson office. No more than two SWCA staff will attend each.

Task 1 Estimated Cost: ██████████

TASK 2. COOPERATING AGENCY PROCESS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM LEAD

Task 2.1. Cooperating Agency Liaison

SWCA will be available to continue attend meetings with cooperating agencies that participate in the EIS process on an as needed basis.

Assumptions:

- up to five meetings will be held with agencies prior to the publication of the DEIS

Task 2.2. Review of EIS for Forest Plan Consistency

John MacIvor, as the ID Team Leader, will continue to review the Proposed Action and all alternatives to determine whether the alternatives are consistent with the Forest Plan. This review will carefully document any aspects of any of the alternatives that are outside of the existing Forest Plan and recommend amendments to the CNF as appropriate. This task and line-item cost also covers the direct labor and expenses for John MacIvor's contribution to this project. SWCA also expects John to continue in his role of NEPA (SWCA) ID Team Leader. In that position John will support Tom Furgason. John will also be called on by Mr. Furgason to contribute to the writing and the technical review of sections of the DEIS to ensure the process and legal requirements of NEPA are integrated.

Assumptions:

- Services rendered until June 2010.
- No more than one week (40 hours) per month will be required.
- All direct expenses (travel, lodging, food, etc.) are agreed upon by RCC.

Task 2 Estimated Cost: ██████████

TASK 3. MANAGEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

Task 3.1. Quarterly Compilation of the Administrative Record

This task involves continuing the assembly, management, and maintenance of the following three files:

- The Administrative File (A/F) provides a digital catalog and paper copy of all information used in the development of the methodology, analysis, and the decision-making process for the EIS. The information contained in this file may be included in the Administrative Record. This file serves as a centrally located, organized library for use by the project staff.
- The Project File provides an organized file for all project information not contained in the Administrative File. This information may be included in the Administrative Record. The primary purpose of this file is to provide for documentation and tracking purposes and to ensure that all information is kept in an organized manner to document any need that arises.
- The Administrative Record is prepared in the event that legal action is filed against the Record of Decision. It provides the U.S. Justice Department with a digital catalog and paper copy of all information used in the development of the methodology, analysis, and the decision-making process for the EIS. The Administrative Record is created principally from the A/F, but Project File documents may also be included. The Forest Service and the Justice Department determine what documents will, or will not, be included in the Administrative Record.
- SWCA will deliver to the CNF, on a quarterly basis, the administrative record and verify that files are in order.

Assumptions:

- Purchase of two additional fireproof file cabinets at \$ [REDACTED].

Task 3 Estimated Cost: [REDACTED]

TASK 4. SCOPING SUMMARY

A majority of the work associated with Scoping was completed in 2008. SWCA has completed all work on Scoping Reports 1 and 2. The CNF has not finalized Scoping Report 3; however, the majority of SWCA's work is completed.

Task 4.1. Scoping Report 1—Scoping Process and Quantitative Results

Task Completed- No further work.

Task 4.2. Scoping Report 2—Content Analysis and Thematic Grouping of Issues

Task Completed- No further work.

Task 4.3. Scoping Report 3—Issue Statements and Issues to be Analyzed in Detail

SWCA will format, print, bind, and distribute five copies of the final Scoping Report 3. No additional work is anticipated.

Assumptions:

- The CNF will not require any additional work on Scoping Report 3 beyond formatting, printing and binding.
- We will produce no more than 5 final reports.

Task 4 Estimated Cost: \$ [REDACTED]

TASK 5. TECHNICAL REPORTS AND ANALYSIS TO ADDRESS SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

SWCA will continue to work on technical analysis related to issues identified by the CNF Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) and those raised during analysis of the Alternatives. **These technical analyses are intended to support the Administrative Record and will only be incorporated by reference into the EIS. The incorporation of the results of this work is covered in below in Task 6.3, Chapter 3.**

Assumptions:

- All Resource Studies (e.g., Socioeconomic), except those specifically identified as SWCA's responsibility in this Task, completed to USFS satisfaction are assumed to remain the responsibility of RCC consultants (e.g., Amec, Moose Mountain, Tetra Tech., ect.).

Task 5.1. Issue 1—Water Resources

SWCA proposes to continue to use a technical Subconsulting team for additional analysis of potential impacts to water resources. On December 10, 2009, Mr. Dale Ortman submitted a technical memorandum titled "Rosemont DEIS Water Resources Cost Estimate for January – April 2010. The tasks identified in Mr. Ortman's technical memorandum are:

1. Manage the work of the technical sub-consultants (SRK, MWH, & Golder);
2. Advise SWCA regarding the mining elements of the project;
3. Participate as a member of the IDT and confer with CNF specialist staff, as required;
4. Primary authorship for the following elements of the DEIS: Proposed Action description, Alternative description, Water Resources Affect Environment (Groundwater); Water Resources Impact Analysis (Groundwater)
5. Manage all DEIS activity for Water Resources
6. Review and edit the DEIS as requested by SWCA

Mr. Ortman estimates the cost to complete these tasks from January to April 2010 is \$ [REDACTED].

As described under Task 1, Mr. Ortman has been charged with the management of three additional subcontractors (SKR, MWH, and Golder Associates). A brief summary of the Tasks that have been assigned to each subcontractor and the preliminary cost estimate are included below.

SRK

1. Mine Site Groundwater Model Review— [REDACTED]
2. Mine Geochemical Review— [REDACTED]
3. Pit Lake Report Review—\$ [REDACTED]
4. Fate and Transport Report Review—\$ [REDACTED]

MWH

1. Review Rosemont response to MWH questions regarding the mine water supply pumping model report—\$ [REDACTED]

Golder Associates

1. Final Landform and Waste Pile Drainage Assessment (one alternative)—\$ [REDACTED]
2. Mine Site Surface Water Control Plan Review—\$ [REDACTED]
3. Storm flow modeling for each alternative [REDACTED]
4. Sediment generation modeling for each alternative—\$ [REDACTED]

Summarized in the following section are critical assumptions we used to estimate schedule and cost to complete the DEIS within the currently proposed schedule:

Assumptions:

- RCC submits all documentation in a timely manner to allow the necessary review and comment/response.
- The Rosemont submittal dealing with all alternatives includes adequate baseline information to support the DEIS.
- All Rosemont submissions reviewed by the technical sub-consultants are deemed adequate by the USFS and SWCA to support the DEIS and the sub-consultant review is finalized with no more than one round of comment/response with Rosemont.

Task 5.2. Issue 2—Visual Resources

Subtask A. Affected Environment Update for 6 Alternatives and Connected Actions

- Update affected environment to summarize visual environment to incorporate the new alternatives, include additional information from alternatives development process.

- Collect KOP in Tucson area with GPS and photography.
- Update basic existing conditions maps to show key observation points (KOPs), sensitive viewer areas, bounds of analysis, concern levels, and scenic objective classes.

Subtask B. Prepare Alternatives Data: Convert CAD and Construct 3D GIS Surface

- Process CAD data and model data for GIS digital elevation modeling. Generate 3-D digital surfaces for the MPO and proposed alternatives at each construction phase selected for simulations.
- Create one set of 3-D working maps and diagrams for USFS and RCC to review potential scene from each KOP to be selected.
- Minimum Budget Assumptions: 6 data sets and 20-yr Phase only

Subtask C. Prepare KOPs, Existing Conditions, Panoramas, and Visibility Maps

- Review all alternatives and KOPs established by the USFS and KOPs to propose to USFS for analysis, simulations, and level of detail for connected actions to define areas where impacts from the project is expected to be highly visible, distantly visible, and not visible (i.e. blocked or out of view)
- Prepare “existing conditions” panoramas for potential KOP simulations and review for use as simulations. For KOPs where project would be visible, select a phase to represent for each KOP in addition to Reclamation (i.e. construction at 5 years, etc.).
- Meet with USFS and RCC to review data, KOP selection and “photo realistic” process (1-2 meetings depending on plan) includes meeting preparations, meetings, and meeting summaries.
- Minimum Budget Assumptions: 3 KOPs 20-yr Phase

Subtask D. Draft Specialist Report Analysis Methodology and Evaluation Criteria

- Draft analysis methods and evaluation criteria that will be used to define and evaluate project effects for the project resources included in the study for all alternatives and KOPs.

Subtask E. Draft Visibility Diagrams and Simulations; Review with USFS/RCC

- Create computer simulations of proposed alternatives (6 total action alternatives) for selected KOPs for highly visible, moderately visible, and distantly visible locations. For budgets other than the minimum level of effort, highly visible and moderately visible KOPs simulations will show 2 phases of the proposed alternatives for each KOP (e.g. TBD construction phase and 20-yr final reclamation). Each simulation will show waste rock and tailing pile forms, roads, and infrastructure.
- For KOPs where the MOP and proposed alternatives would not be visible, prepare a section diagram or labeled panorama showing key landscape features and visual screen.

- Prepare photorealistic simulation images for KOPs.
- Review draft simulations with resources specialist from RCC, USFS, and SWCA to direct specific aspects of renderings; reclamation, soils, vegetation, etc.
- Complete a Draft review with USFS and RCC staff at meeting in Tucson.

Subtask F. Prepare Environmental Consequences Analysis

- Prepare an environmental consequences analysis for Specialist Report. Report should analyze differences in effects from changes in the tailing pile design specifics or location and potential for remediation and mitigation to affect long-term visual quality.
- Deliverables: Completed Visual Resources Specialist Report for all alternatives including draft simulations, visibility diagrams, and maps.

Subtask G. Finalize Diagrams and Simulations; Review with USFS/RCC

- Complete changes to simulations
- Submit final formatted figures (e.g. panoramas, diagrams, simulations) to USFS and RCC for final approval.

Subtask H. Final Specialist Report.

- Finalize Specialist Report and review with USFS.

Assumptions:

- Costs are based upon deliverables for each proposal according to the number of KOPs brought forward for simulations and figure diagrams. All alternatives will describe up to 24 KOPs for the analysis process. Revised USFS and USFS original budgets include up to 8 panoramas, non-visible KOPs diagrams for up to 6 KOPs, and simulations of highly visible and moderately visible KOPs for 8 KOPs for each of 6 proposed alternatives (up to 48 simulations) at 20-yr final reclamation and up to 6 LOPs for a construction phase per alternative (36 simulations). However, not all KOPs will require simulations for all alternatives (i.e. Sycamore canyon will not be visible from many of the KOPs along SR 83). KOPs and level of detail for simulations will be formalized at the initial simulation meeting; however costs are assumed based upon the list provided by the USFS Simulation Strategy.
- RCC to provide all data and elevations required for simulations, including a 3D model of any facilities, structures, or transmission infrastructure. USFS, RCC and SWCA will collectively contribute example imagery for depicting coloration, texture, formations, structures, and other details for portrayal in the simulations prior to simulations initiating. Surface data or changes to surface data that is provided/requested after 3D modeling is initiated will be incorporated on a time and materials basis. Direction regarding these details that is received after simulations have been initiated that varies dramatically may result in a change order. Simulations that require detailed development of the mine facility will be completed on a time and materials basis. Field work for 10 of the 14 KOPs has already been collected under the Visual Technical Report scope. SWCA assumes

that Mt. Wrightson has been photographed by Rosemont's subcontractors and SWCA will be able to use this panorama for simulations. It is assumed that field documentation will be required for Box Canyon and Tucson KOPs at a minimum. Changes to the KOPs or to the construction phase selected for simulation after this meeting may require additional field work and may result in a change order. Additional KOPs, simulations, phases, or alternatives may be requested for an additional fee.

- Simulations will be classified as "highly visible" or "moderately visible". Highly visible simulations will show detailed variations in land form, vegetation, color, and texture for tailings and waste rock placement. Moderately visible simulations will show general variations in land form, vegetation, color and texture due to the level of detail being reduced by the distance of the viewer from the project area.
- Should KOPs require extensive visualization of mining facilities, conveyors, equipment, transmission lines, etc, the work for these layers will be performed on a time and material basis, due to the unpredictable level of detail and effort required for these structures.
- RCC and USFS are to agree upon the level of reclamation and vegetation success to be rendered prior to initiation of photoreal simulations. Changes in the direction given to SWCA to represent these aspects will require a change order, should they require additional time and effort to address.
- RCC will provide example photographs of existing reclamation, mining structures, vegetation mixes, soil types and colors, and other data to SWCA prior to the initiation of the simulations. Necessary imagery will be discussed at simulation initiation meeting in Task 1.
- This estimate assumes that SWCA will create 3D surfaces for MPO and proposed alternatives from RCC CAD drawings for up to 2 phases of construction. Should RCC provide GIS surfaces, these costs may be reduced accordingly (Task 2). Changes in data, proposed action, and level of detail requested for simulations, phases of construction, and resolution of imagery after project initiation will require adjustments based upon time and materials. SWCA will submit surfaces to RCC and USFS for review prior to creation of simulations.
- Cost estimate includes two in-person meetings as two trips to Tucson for Marcie Bidwell to work with USFS and RCC on simulations, per direction of USFS staff. Additional trips may be required by USFS or RCC, and these will be arranged through an additional change order. Each task includes meeting hours for senior staff, visual specialist, editors as necessary and senior GIS under each task; additional meetings may be arranged on a time and materials basis.
- This scope of work includes one round of draft review and one round of final review. Additional changes, reviews, or updates will require an additional change order. Ideally, review of final images will require minimal edits agreeable to both USFS and RCC for accurate portrayal of the MPO. Explorations of mitigation or options (such as painting facilities various colors or reducing pit contrast through surface application) are considered alternatives and would be covered under an additional scope. USFS and RCC should attempt to synchronize their comments

prior to submittal to SWCA; should differences of opinion occur, SWCA will be required to default to USFS guidance as the official SWCA client.

Task 5.3. Issue 3—Biological Resources

On November 6, 2009, a document entitled “Recommendations for Scope of Work for SWCA on Proposed Rosemont Copper Mine Project from the Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plant Program” was prepared and distributed by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The purpose of this memorandum was to

1) identify which of the 11 tasks proposed in the FS document are, in the opinion of SWCA, necessary for the successful completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS); 2) evaluate the adequacy/limitations of existing information for each of these required tasks; and 3) provide a brief scope of work and a cost for task completion, where appropriate.

Although critical in evaluating the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures, tasks or portions of tasks that address long-term monitoring are not addressed in detail in this memorandum, which, as mentioned previously, is focused on those tasks considered necessary for the completion of the DEIS. Not included in the November 6, 2009 FS document are two additional tasks considered by SWCA as being necessary to the completion DEIS: 1) a lesser long-nosed bat synthesis report; and 2) a riparian study, including map.

Assumptions:

- No further additions by the CNF, BLM, or U.S. Corps of Engineers (COE) to the species requiring consideration.
- One review of the documents by the CNF, BLM, and COE to be completed concurrently.
- No species-specific surveys will be completed by SWCA.
- No additional site visits will be required.

Task 5.4. Issue 7—Cultural Resources, and Ethnohistory (To be completed by SWCA)

Subtask A: Class III Archaeological Survey Report for MPO:

We have been awaiting comment from CNF to make the report final and file it with the Arizona State Museum (the curation fees have already been charged). Upon receipt of comments, we will revise report accordingly. Mary Farrell asked for a hard copy of the draft to send to SHPO for review. No more than five hard copies of the final will be delivered.

Assumptions:

- All requested edits and revisions will be received from the Coronado at one time.
- No additional meetings or site visits will be required.
- A Class I survey is sufficient for all action alternatives.

Subtask B: Class I Archaeological Records Research and Predictive Model for 4 Mine Alternatives:

The records search will include a 1 mile radius buffer zone around each Alternative (Barrel/McCleary; Scholfield/McCleary; Sycamore/Upper Barrel; and Barrel Only) footprint, including access roads and utilities/slurry lines not covered by EPG. We'll request an electronic data search by AZSITE, visit CNF to view their records, and include review of the unrecorded ANAMAX loci. The report will: discuss the previous surveys and recorded sites; compare the types of sites and environmental setting in each Alternative with similar settings in the MPO; and based on the differences observed in the MPO records search and the 2008 field survey, predict what types and numbers of sites might yet be unrecorded in each alternative.

Assumptions:

- Assumes six alternatives will be analyzed. Any new alternatives would require an additional request for data from the ASM.

Subtask C: Ethnohistory

An Ethnohistory report was requested by the CNF Archaeologist. The data gathering portion of the task is complete (including two recent interviews). A final report will be prepared at the direction of the CNF with input from Tribes with local expertise. This report will support the results of the CNF's requirements under Section 106 of the NHPA.

Assumptions:

- This task can be completed in 60 hours or fewer.
- No more than one review will be required by the CNF, BLM, COE, and tribes.

Subtask D: Cultural Resources Administrative Record:

The completion of the Cultural Resources report required a comprehensive citation of hundreds of reports and supporting documentation. Per the Coronado's direction, copies of all references must be included in the Administrative Record. Copies of the title and cited pages will be compiled for all references in the Class III Survey Report, the Ethnohistory, and the Class I Archival Records Search for the Alternatives (nearly 700 references). Completion of this task will require substantial staff time at the ASM and UA library copying cited literature. In addition to substantial copying time and fees, completion of this task will require ordering dozens of rare publications.

Assumptions:

- Does not include any redaction of sensitive information
- No more than 480 staff hours will be required.

Task 5.5. Issue 5—Socioeconomic

RCC submitted a revised Socioeconomic report that SWCA will use in the analysis. Additional research will be conducted to assess potential impacts to tourism and local

property values. These charges are included in the preparation of Chapter 3 of the DEIS (Task 6.3 of this scope).

Estimated Cost: Task completed by RCC.

Task 5.6. Issue 6—Transportation

RCC submitted a Traffic Analysis that SWCA will use in the analysis.

Estimated Cost: Task completed by RCC.

Task 5.7. Issue 7—Air Quality (To be completed by RCC Consultant)

RCC submitted a Traffic Analysis that SWCA will use in the analysis.

Estimated Cost: Task completed by RCC.

Task 5.8. Issue 7—Recreation (New Task)

During the Rosemont EIS revision process, SWCA will complete the following actions to address critical data gaps related to recreation issues as identified by the Forest Service:

- Field trip to visit the major recreation sites in the area.
- Review background documents and information as requested by Debby Kriegel in order to better characterize recreation resources in the area of analysis:
 - *Research recreation special use permittees in the Rosemont area that may be affected by the mine. Contact Duane Bennett to discuss further.*
 - *Follow up on the status of revision of Tetra Tech report "State Route (SR) 83 Scenic Road Evaluation for Rosemont". On September 14, 2009, Debby provided comments to Rosemont. Contact the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Scenic Roads Program staff to discuss the mine and determine whether the scenic road status would change.*

Recommended Mitigations

SWCA will research potential mitigations to the loss of recreation resources that would result from the proposed action and alternatives. Coordinate with Debby Kriegel to get minutes from the meetings she has had with Green Valley Hiking Club, Arizona Trail Association, and the Arizona Game and Fish Department. In addition, contact Tom Dwyer (Forest Service Wilderness, Trails, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Dispersed Rec Program Manager, SW Regional Office, 505-842-3233) and Jonathon Stevens (Forest Service Congressional Designated Areas and Trails Program Manager, Washington Office).

Assumptions:

- No more than one site visit will be required.
- Only six alternatives will be analyzed.
- No additional reports will be required to satisfy the CNF Recreation Specialist.

Task 5.9. Issue 8—Night Skies (*New Task*)

To complete the night time lighting analysis (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) Dark Sky Partners (DSP), a subconsultant to SWCA, will engage in modeling analyses that result in outputs suitable for describing pre- and post-project sky glow conditions from a suitable number of observation points (currently estimated at six) surrounding the project area (see Attached scope and cost estimate from DSP). Prior to initiating sky glow modeling it will be necessary to coordinate with pertinent Coronado National Forest (CNF) personnel, Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory (FLWO) personnel, and any other parties CNF deems necessary to ensure the analysis consists of the appropriate observation points, assumptions, and other information. Following modeling DSP will produce a technical report for use in completing the description of the Affected Environment and analyzing the Environmental Consequences.

Assumptions:

- This cost estimate from DSP estimates up to \$ [REDACTED] as a baseline cost estimate for a one baseline lighting scenario and six observation points including modeling and technical report writing. Additional lighting scenarios (alternatives) would cost up to \$ [REDACTED] each.

Task 5 Estimated Cost: \$ [REDACTED]

TASK 6. EIS DOCUMENT

Task 6.1. Chapter 1— Purpose of and Need for Action

Although the CNF has Accepted SWCA's draft as complete, they have recently asked SWCA to assist in preparing the BLM and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers decision space, content review, and technical editing.

Assumptions:

- It is anticipated that SWCA's effort will be less than 12 hours of staff time.

Task 6.2. Chapter 2—Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action

SWCA will complete Alternatives Considered but Dismissed, dismissal rational, and final description of up to six alternatives. This includes assisting the CNF with finalizing the Cooperating Agency Alternative,

SWCA will also work with the CNF and Rosemont to complete the Mitigation section of Chapter 2, including a memorandum for the file that documents the process used to develop Mitigation.

Assumptions:

- No more that six alternatives will be considered throughout the EIS

- CNF will not require additional support for alternatives considered but dismissed from SWCA's technical subconsultants.
- RCC will submit an 404 (b)(1) alternatives analysis as accepted by the COE.
- Tucson Electric Power Company will submit a complete alternatives analysis for the utility lines
- No additional meetings will be required to complete the Mitigation portion of the EIS.

Task 6.3. Chapter 3—Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

SWCA will revise the Affected Environment portion of the EIS based on comments provided by the CNF IDT. New information will be incorporated as it is received (e.g., Pit Lake Geochemistry). The Environmental Consequences will be analyzed for up to six alternatives, including the No Action. Analysis will focus on the following sections:

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

- 3.1 Air Quality
- 3.2 Hydrology
- 3.3 Geology and Minerals
- 3.4 Soils and Reclamation
- 3.5 Biological Resources
- 3.6 Fuels and Fire Management
- 3.7 Cultural Resources
- 3.8 Socioeconomics/Environmental Justice
- 3.9 Visual Resources
- 3.10 Transportation/Access
- 3.11 Land Use
- 3.12 Recreation and Wilderness
- 3.13 Livestock and Grazing
- 3.14 Noise
- 3.15 Night Skies
- 3.16 Hazardous Materials
- 3.17 Public Health and Safety

Assumptions:

- All supporting documentation and analysis submitted by RCC is technically acceptable and meets CNF standards and expectations with respect to best available science. This assumes that all studies were completed to industry standards.
- CNF staff will only provide comments on new material submitted. Revisions to previously approved work are not covered under this task.
- No changes to the overall format or outline of the DEIS will be made by the CNF.

Task 6.4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES (ORIGINALLY CHAPTER 4)

This Task was combined with Task 6.3 as requested by the CNF.

Task 6.5. CHAPTERS 4–8 AND APPENDICES

- 4.0 AGENCIES CONSULTED
- 5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS
- 6.0 LITERATURE CITED
- 7.0 GLOSSARY
- 8.0 INDEX
- APPENDICES

Assumptions:

- One review by the CNF will be needed for final approval and there will be no timing delays as a result of any CNF review schedule changes.

Task 6 Estimated Cost: \$ [REDACTED]

TASK 7. COMPILATION AND FORMATTING OF THE DEIS

The objective of this task will be to compile the narratives and exhibits developed in the preceding tasks into a comprehensive Draft EIS that fulfills the requirements of the Forest Service as well as the National Environmental Policy Act.

Task 7.1. Development of Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Statement

An administrative (review) Draft EIS will be prepared under this task. This draft will be formatted according to CNF guidance and will be prepared using Adobe InDesign or similar professional layout software. The administrative Draft EIS shall include all components required for a complete EIS document, including the following:

1. Purpose of and Need for Action
 2. Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action
 3. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences
 4. Agencies Consulted
 5. List of Preparers
 6. Literature Cited
 7. Glossary
 8. Index
- Appendices, as appropriate

Assumptions:

- No changes in the Style Guide recommended by the CNF.
- No changes in the outline approved by the CNF.

Task 7.2. Team Review of Administrative Draft Environmental Impact Statement

FS will review both the first administrative Draft EIS and the second administrative Draft EIS. Review comments and revisions will be prepared under this task.

Assumptions:

- SWCA and USFS will participate in one internal conference call per respective administrative review of the Draft EIS.
- No more than two hard copies will be produced for the CNF.

Task 7.3. Formatting of Draft Environmental Impact Statement

After the two rounds of editorial review and revision of the administrative Draft EIS, the document will be finalized for submission to Forest Service and RCC for approval.

Assumptions:

- DEIS will be submitted as a camera ready document in Adobe Acrobat for GPO printing

Task 7 Estimated Cost: \$ [REDACTED]

TASK 8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

SWCA will work with the CNF to develop a Public Participation Plan (PPP) to solicit comments on the DEIS. This plan will clearly identify obligations under NEPA and the steps that will be taken by the CNF to meet those requirements. The plan will also:

- provide a schedule for the timely publication of the Notice of Availability (NOA);
- detail the schedule and format for public hearings;
- identify the media (print, direct mailings, etc.,) to be used to notify the public; and
- provide the schedule for publishing advertisements in local papers for the hearings.

All drafts will be submitted in electronic (MS Word) format and five hard copies of the final will be submitted to the Coronado.

Assumptions:

- Two coordination meetings will be sufficient to coordinate the PPP.
- Expenses for meeting locations, mailings, and advertising are not included in this estimate.

- The PPP will be no more than 20 pages in length.
- Only one review by the CNF will be required.

Task 8 Estimated Cost: \$ [REDACTED]

TASK 9. ADDITIONAL CNF REQUESTS

The nature of the NEPA process is such that not all possible contingencies can be identified in a SOW. SWCA anticipates that the CNF will likely request work that is not outlined in either this scope or the Memorandum of Understanding between the CNF and Rosemont. All requests by the CNF for work not outlined in this scope of work will be documented and submitted to RCC prior to initiation. Upon receipt of written approval of a scope and budget from RCC, SWCA will initiate work on the agreed-upon out-of-scope tasks. SWCA will then bill under this task on a Time and Materials basis per our standard 2010 billing rates (Attached).

ESTIMATED CONTRACT MODIFICATION COST SUMMARY

| TASK | COST |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 Management of the NEPA Process | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 2 Cooperating Agency Process and Interdisciplinary Team Lead | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 3 Management of Administrative File | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 4 Scoping Summary | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 5 Detailed Technical Reports to Address Significant Issues | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 6 EIS Document | |
| 6.1 Chapter 1 – Purpose of and Need for Action | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 6.2 Chapter 2 – Alternatives, Including the Proposed Action | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 6.3 Chapter 3 – Affected Environment and Environmental Consultants | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 6.4 Chapter 4 – Environmental Consequences | <i>combined with Task 6.3</i> |
| 6.5 Chapters 4–8 and Appendices | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 7 Compilation and Formatting of the DEIS (Three Iterations) | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 8 Public Participation Plan | \$ [REDACTED] |
| 9 Additional CNF Requests | T&M |
| Total Estimated Cost | \$ [REDACTED] |