KINROSS

FORT KNOX MINE

RECLAMATIONAND CLOSURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1 REVISION 1

Prepared By:

Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc. (a subsidiary of Kinross Gold Corporation) PO Box 73726 Fairbanks, Alaska 99707-3726

May 2021

FORT KNOX MINE

RECLAMATION AND CLOSURE PLAN AMENDMENT 1 REVISION 1

Submitted to:

Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Mining, Land and Water 3700 Airport Way Fairbanks, Alaska 99709

Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation Division of Water 610 University Avenue Fairbanks, Alaska 99709-3643

Department of the Army U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District Regulatory Division 2175 University Avenue, Suite #201E Fairbanks, Alaska 99709

Submitted by:

Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc. A Subsidiary of Kinross Gold Corporation PO Box 73726 Fairbanks, Alaska 99707-3726

May 2021

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION				
	1.1	Purpose	3		
	1.2	Location and Land Status	3		
2	PRO	JECT CONDITIONS	6		
	2.1	Reclamation Activities	6		
	2.2	Proposed Development	6		
	2.3	Surface Disturbance	8		
	2.4	Growth Media Inventory	10		
	*Stoc	kpile consumed in 2020 reclamation activities	10		
	2.5	Growth Media Requirements	11		
3	RECLAMATION PRACTICES				
	3.1	General Reclamation Procedures	13		
	3.2	Drainage	15		
		Water Management	17		
	3.3	Current Conditions	17		
4	EST	IMATE OF RECLAMATION AND CLOSURE COSTS	18		
	4.1	Reclamation Cost Estimate Update	18		
	4.2	SRCE Model Update	18		
	4.3	Indirect Costs	19		
	4.4	Cost Summary	19		

APPENDICES

Α	Victoria	Creek	Mining	Claims
---	----------	-------	--------	--------

B SRCE Figures

TABLES

Table 2-1:	Disturbance Area at LOM	8
Table 2-2:	Estimated Growth Media Volumes	10
Table 2-3:	Topsoil Requirement Premature Closure	11
Table 4-1	Pit Lake Transfer Summary - Premature Closure End of 2020	17
Table 4-2	Pit Lake Transfer Summary - Premature Closure End of 2021	17
Table 5-1:	Indirect Cost Comparison	19
Table 5-2:	Reclamation and Closure Cost Estimate Comparison	20

FIGURES

Figure 1-1:	Project Location	
Figure 1-2:	Surface Ownership 5	
Figure 2-1:	2020 Reclamation Activity	
Figure 2-2:	Victoria Creek WRD Post Mining Topography	
Figure 2-3:	Growth Media and Borrow Areas 12	
Figure 3-1:	Victoria Creek WRD Post Reclamation Topography 14	
Figure 3-2:	Victoria Creek WRD Closure Drainage Plan 16	

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

Fairbanks Gold Mining Inc. (FGMI), a wholly owned subsidiary of Kinross Gold U.S.A. Inc (KGC), is requesting an amendment (Amendment 1) to the Reclamation and Closure Plan (RCP) Dated January 2020 (F20209852RPA). Modifications to the mine plan require additional waste rock storage to support mining operations. This amendment includes a description of the proposed waste rock dump (WRD) construction, reclamation activities and updated financial assurance (FA) costs. The FA model is calculated using Standardized Reclamation Cost Estimator (SRCE). In addition, the FA costs have been revised, assuming a premature closure scenario is year is now 2021 versus the previous RCP plan scenario of 2020. Amendment 1 will be incorporated into the next full reclamation plan update.

This document will be submitted to:

- Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Division of Mining (ADNR) in accordance with AS 27.19.010 et. seq. and 11 AAC 97.100 et. seq.
- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), Division of Water, as required by Waste Management Permit 2014-DB0002, Modification #2
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) as required by the Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit No. N-920574, Fish Creek.

1.2 Location and Land Status

The project site is located approximately 15 air miles northeast of Fairbanks, Alaska in the Fish Creek drainage, more specifically, the project area is in portions of Sections 4-5, 7-12, 13-23, and 26-27, T2N, R2E, Fairbanks Meridian; and Sections 7-8 and 17-19, T2N, R3E, Fairbanks Meridian.

Amendment 1 increases the disturbance area to include development within Sections 27, 28, and 29; T2N, R2E. **Figure 1-1** illustrates the location of the development with relation to the current mine operations.

Amendment 1 requires an additional mineral lease from the Alaska Trust Land Office (TLO) of approximately 751.62 acres. The Victoria Creek TLO lease increases the for a total leased area from 8,711 acres to 9,463 acres. All other ownership and areas within the project disturbance boundary remain unchanged. Appendix A of the 2020 Reclamation and Closure plan contains the claim descriptions for the current conditions. Appendix B of this document include the detailed description of the expanded claim boundary. **Figure 1-2** illustrates the surface and private area owned by FGMI and Amendment area noted above.

Figure 1-1: Project Location



P:\Fort_Knox\040_Drafting\Task_330_Vic_Cr_WRD_Addendum_1\226900.020_FIG_2020_PROJECT_LOCATION.mxd

Figure 1-2: Surface Ownership



2 **PROJECT CONDITIONS**

The mine plan has been modified to accommodate additional waste rock storage in a new WRD located in Victoria Creek and modification of the Yellow Pup WRD. In addition, reclamation activities were performed in year 2020 which reduce the finical assurance (FA) liabilities required for reclamation and closure. This amendment summarizes new construction activities and reclamation performed in 2020.

2.1 Reclamation Activities

Reclamation activities were performed on site in 2020, slightly reducing the FA liability. These activities include placement of cover volume on the TSF and reclamation of two material borrow sites. The RCP assumed a premature closure scenario in year 2020 as the largest liability in terms of disturbed area and earthwork activities requiring reclamation. Following year 2020, liabilities decrease as the mine plan progresses towards the closure configuration, mostly by the reduction of cover required on the TSF.

Placement of waste rock cover on the TSF began in 2019 and will continue for the next several years. As more cover is placed on tailings, the liability to reclaim the TSF will decrease. The SRCE model has been updated to reflect a reduction in cover required on the TSF and end of year 2020.

Minor changes to other WRDs and heap leach pads were minimal in terms of earthwork costs. The footprints did not increase, and grading costs are negligible as bench sizes are similar in length and height within the same footprints. The largest liability for a premature closure scenario remains the cover placement on the TSF. Reclamation costs for earthworks for the WRD and heap leach pads do not vary significantly from the current condition to the end of mining condition.

TSF South Borrow Site 1 and TSF Borrow Site 2 were reclaimed in 2020 equaling a total of 84.6 acres. The areas were regraded and covered with growth media sourced from the stockpile within TSF Borrow Site 1 (0.9 acres). The borrow sites were scarified and seeded. **Figure 2-1** illustrates the reclamation activity completed in 2020. The total reclaimed area completed in 2020 is approximately 85.5 acres

The FA cost model has been updated to reflect these changes; further detail can be found in Section 4.

2.2 Proposed Development

Changes to the mine plan require additional waste rock storage. The Yellow Pup WRD will be modified and a new waste rock dump, Victoria Creek WRD, will be developed south of Yellow Pup WRD. The Victoria Creek WRD will be constructed in two locations. The northern location will be constructed over a portion of the existing Yellow Pup WRD footprint and onto adjacent undeveloped land. The southern section will be constructed south Yellow Pup WRD on a south facing slope of the upper reaches of the Victoria creek watershed.

The construction of the Victoria Creek WRD will be similar to existing WRDs on site. The construction generally involves stripping and stockpiling suitable growth media (assume 12 inches), preparing a stable foundation for dump construction and end dumping waste rock in a benched configuration from the bottom, up. The benches are developed to allow for a regraded slope at closure mimicking slopes found near the project. Victoria Creek WRD development includes placement of approximately 85 Mtons of waste rock with capacity of up to 106 Mtons. The dump is constructed on approximately 498.3 acres of previously disturbed and undisturbed ground. Approximately 107.3 acres will be within the existing Yellow Pup WRD footprint and 391.0 acres will be on undisturbed ground. **Figure 2-2** depicts the proposed configuration of the Victoria Creek WRD.

Figure 2-1: 2020 Reclamation Activity



2.3 Surface Disturbance

The two-dimensional area listed in **Error! Not a valid bookmark self-reference.** include disturbances within the FGMI Millsite Lease boundary on state and private lands over the life-of-the mine at Fort Knox Mine. The construction of the Victoria Creek WRD will increase the disturbance by approximately 392.7 However; reclamation of the TSF borrow areas and GM stockpile and integration of the access road area within the Victoria Creek WRD's area, results in a net disturbance increase of approximately 302.1 acres. Growth media stripped for the construction of the Victoria Creek WRD will be stockpiled near the rim of the pit adding approximately 1.4 acres of disturbance. **Figure 2-2** illustrates the corresponding disturbance area changes.

Location	2020 Reclamation Plan Acres Disturbed	Amendment 1 (Victoria Creek WRD) Acres Disturbed
Waste Rock Dumps	987.3	+391.3
Heap Leach	731.7	
Roads	301.2	(-5.1) ^a
Pit	893	
Buildings Complexes and Laydown yards	252.2	
GM Stockpiles and GM Borrow areas	208.2	+1.4 –(0.9) ^b = 0.5
Borrow Areas	163.1	(-84.6)°
TSF Surface	897.9	
Phase 1 Causeway	85	
TSF Dam Crest and Surrounding Area	115.9	
Ore Stockpiles	55.9	
FGMI Power Lines	40.7	
Developed Wetlands	218.5	
Water Supply Reservoir & Dam	207.1	
subtotal	5,157.7	302.1
Total	5,157.7	5,459.8

Table 2-1: Disturbance Area at LOM

^a The Victoria Creek WRD development footprint integrates a portion of an existing access road – The road footprint was reclassified as WRD and included in the WRD footprint

^b The growth media stockpile located in the Tailings South Borrow areas was consumed in reclamation

^c Reclamation of the Tailings South Borrow Areas 1 and 2

Figure 2-2: Victoria Creek WRD Post Mining Topography



P:\Fort_Knox\040_Drafting\Task_330_Vic_Cr_WRD_Addendum_1\226900.020_FIG_2020_PMC_TOPOGRAPHY.mxd

2.4 Growth Media Inventory

Prior to construction of Victoria Creek WRD, suitable growth media will be stripped and stockpiled for later use during reclamation. It is anticipated that a minimum of approximately one foot of growth media will be stripped within the footprint of the proposed development for Victoria Creek WRD. The proposed Victoria Creek Growth Media stockpile will be located near the crest of the Yellow Pup WRD within a previously undisturbed area. The location of the Victoria Creek Growth media stockpile is depicted in **Figure 2-3**.

Table 2-2 provides a summary of growth media salvaged and potential borrow sources.

Site (Stockpile or Borrow Area)	2020 REC Plan Volume Available (CY)	Amendment 1 Volume Available (CY)
Victoria Creek GM (Stockpile)	N/A	630,900
WC Heap Leach GM 1 (stockpile)	782,400	782,400
Barnes Creek GM 1 (stockpile)	377,600	377,600
Barnes Creek GM 2 (stockpile)	240,800	240,800
Barnes Creek GM 3 (stockpile)	200,300	200,300
Barnes Creek GM 4 (stockpile)	14,170	14,170
Yellow Pup GM 1 (stockpile)	844,500	844,500
Yellow Pup GM 2 (stockpile)	13,100	13,100
Yellow Pup GM 3 (stockpile)	37,900	37,900
TSF South GM 1 (stockpile)	291,400	291,400
TSF South GM 2 (stockpile)*	26,800	0
TSF North GM (borrow area)	3,186,400	3,186,400
WC Heap Leach GM 2 (borrow area)	1,625,000	1,625,000
Total Stockpile	2,828,970	3,433,070
Total Borrow Available	4,811,400	4,811,400
Total Available	7,640,370	8,244,470

 Table 2-2:
 Estimated Growth Media Volumes

*Stockpile consumed in 2020 reclamation activities

2.5 Growth Media Requirements

The Standard Reclamation Cost Estimator (SRCE) Model calculates the true volume of cover and topsoil required based on the slope area. These volumes are generally 5-10% greater than areas calculated using 2D surface measurements multiplied by depth. A detailed summary of the growth media volume required for reclamation calculated using SRCE is found in **Table 2-3**. Growth media stockpiles and borrow areas exceed calculated volumes required for reclamation.

Facility	2020 REC Plan Volume Required (CY)	Amendment 1 Volume Required (CY)
Waste Rock Dumps	1,735,523	2,547,962
Tailings Storage Facility	1,565,081	1,572,629
Heap Leach Pads	1,202,757	1,202,757
Yards/Laydown Areas	159,024	159,024
Wetland Areas	17,424	17,424
Total	4,679,809	5,499,796

 Table 2-3:
 Topsoil Requirement Premature Closure

Figure 2-3: Growth Media and Borrow Areas



3 RECLAMATION PRACTICES

Reclamation practices for Addendum 1 will be consistent with the approved methods detailed in the 2020 RCP. The schedule for reclamation of Victoria Creek WRD will be concurrent with the Yellow Pup WRD reclamation activities and will not delay the reclamation timeline. The Victoria Creek WRD is anticipated to be reclaimed within the next 5-year permit cycle. Conservatively, the FA calculation assumes that the Victoria Creek WRD is fully constructed at end of year 2021 and must be reclaimed.

3.1 General Reclamation Procedures

The Victoria Creek WRD will be graded, contoured and revegetated. A minimum of one foot of growth media will be applied to the graded and contoured slopes; slopes will be scarified and seeded. Generally, slopes will be graded to a maximum slope of 2.5H:1V or flatter. The design as presented in **Figure 3-1** includes contoured slopes between 2.5H:1V and 3H:1V.

Figure 3-1: Victoria Creek WRD Post Reclamation Topography



3.2 Drainage

The overall site drainage plan remains unchanged. All impacted water will report to the Pit or TSF prior to treatment and release. The runoff from the Victoria Creek WRD is not expected to impact water quality or deviate from previous assumptions of runoff from waste rock included in the 2020 Reclamation Plan. A portion of the proposed Victoria Creek WRD will drain into the Victoria creek watershed (a recent placer mining area).

Best management practices (BMPs) will be employed during operations and until the site is reclaimed and stabilized to minimize erosion and sediment accumulation downstream. BMPs may include vegetated buffers, sediment collection ponds, or methods to reduce erosion potential during operations such as temporary grading or seeding. The current closure concept includes installation of a riprap lined swale along the eastern groin of the final graded surface of the Victoria Creek WRD within Victoria Creek watershed. Runoff generated and collected along this channel is expected to be minor, and erosion potential is expected to be low once vegetation has been reestablished. The majority of the WRD will be graded to minimize concentration of runoff and shed water across a large face, reducing concentration of runoff and thus erosion potential. **Figure 3-2** represents an updated drainage plan for the site.

The site wide water balance for operations and closure is not expected to be impacted by the change in surface disturbance. Runoff into Victoria creek is not included in the water balance and will likely remain similar during operations due to adsorption of water by the waste rock and the non-concentrated release of runoff along the perimeter of the toe. After reclamation is complete, runoff and drainage patterns will return to near pre-mining conditions. An updated water balance will be provided with the next full submission of a reclamation plan.

Figure 3-2: Victoria Creek WRD Closure Drainage Plan



Water Management

3.3 Current Conditions

Throughout year 2020, water inventories in the tailings storage facility (TSF) has been reduced from the inventory presented in the 2020 Reclamation Plan. In the event of a premature closure scenario (assuming year 2021) The remaining inventory would be pumped to the Pit. The FA model has been adjusted to reflect a reduction of pumping costs between the 2020 plan and the current inventory (October 2020 bathometric survey). The 2020 RCP inventory used for the FA is detailed in **Table 3-1**, the inventory used for 2021 FA update is detailed below in **Table 3-2**.

Water inventories within the TSF presented in the 2020 RCP have been reduced from 5,872 acrefeet to approximately 1,072 acre-feet the end of 2021. The inventory as of October 2020 is approximately 1,800 acre-ft. The inventory will be reduced further throughout 2021. In the 2020 RCP, the excess water was pumped from the TSF to the pit in the event of a premature closure. The scheme is still the same however the reduction of inventory results in a lower liability and water volume to pump to the pit in 2021. This minor reduction in cost but has been included in the updated FA model.

Transfer	Period	TSF Decant Pond Transfers	TSF Seepage System Pumping	Heap Leach Facility Transfers
			Ac-ft	
TSF to Pit	2021	5,872	-	-
HLP Draindown	2021	-	-	2,929
TSF seepage to Pit	2021-2054	-	8,079	

 Table 3-1
 Pit Lake Transfer Summary - Premature Closure End of 2020

Table 3-2 Pit Lake Transfer Summary	- Premature Closure End of 2021
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Transfer	Period	TSF Decant Pond Transfers TSF Seepage System Pumping		Heap Leach Facility Transfers
			Ac-ft	
TSF to Pit	2021	1,072	-	-
HLP Draindown	2021	-	-	2,929
TSF seepage to Pit	2021-2054	-	8,079	

4 ESTIMATE OF RECLAMATION AND CLOSURE COSTS

4.1 Reclamation Cost Estimate Update

The reclamation estimate has been updated for the entire project to include Amendment 1. The reclamation activity in 2020 results in a decrease in costs from **\$100,619,434** to **\$100,058,382** based on the premature closure scenario in year 2021 and long-term post closure agreement. The cashflows for post closure years 11-100 are discounted at a rate of 4.3% as noted below. For the 2020 Reclamation Plan, FGMI reviewed the mine plans for 2019-2023, (five-year permit cycle) and determined the largest liability is in year 2020. Now that 2020 has passed, the next highest liability anticipated is in year 2021 and will decline until cover is placed on the TSF. As mining activities continue following year 2021 and throughout the LOM plan, reclamation quantities will decrease as closure actives are executed, or facilities mature towards their designed closure form. As facilities mature, the cost of reclamation will decrease (e.g. cover placement on the TSF, regrading the HLPs, and WRD, etc.).

4.2 SRCE Model Update

Minor changes were made to the SRCE model to reflect changes between the 2020 and 2021 mine plan and reclamation liabilities. The following is a brief summary of additional changes to the 2020 SRCE model which are not part of Amendment 1, all other quantities rates and assumptions remain the same.

- 1. Approximately 32 acres of the TSF near the Phase 1 Causeway and the Fish Creek WRD has been backfilled, resulting in a reduction of cover material needed for reclamation. In addition minor changes to the Phase 1 Causeway Grading has been updated to reflect current conditions.
- 2. A significant volume of decant water within the TSF has been treated and discharged. The 2020 Reclamation Plan, Premature Closure Estimate assumed that this volume would be transferred to the pit. A reduction in volume and pumping costs has been deducted from the "Solution Management" tab in the SRCE model.
- 3. Riprap in the 2020 SRCE model was assumed to be sourced by drilling and blasting, however riprap will be sourced by screening waste rock form the Yellow Pup WRD. Blasting was eliminated from the estimate.
- 4. Labor rates have been updated to the most current values found in *Laborers' and Mechanics' Minimum Rates of Pay*, Effective September 2020 (Pamphlet 600 Title 36); the labor rate for general laborer was miss-entered in the SRCE Cost Data file in the 2020 estimate. The revised rate effects (lowers) pumping building demolition costs.
- 5. Fuel Rates were updated reflect fuel prices in Fairbanks using similar procedures noted in the 2020 SRCE estimate (2021 fuel price = \$2.56/gal)
- 6. Energy prices were updated to reflect the most current rates published online by Golden Valley Electric. (2021 electrical power cost = \$0.12/kWh)
- 7. Equipment rates were not updated. NC Machine provided rates near the end of 2019, and confirmed in mid-2020 that rates had not increased for 2020. The maintenance and equipment consumables have been updated using Nevada Rates for 2020 plus 15%.
- 8. Indirect costs for post reclamation activities were reduced.

4.3 Indirect Costs

Post reclamation indirect costs were reduced based on probability that long-term contracts would be established to maintain the site. The site will be in a stable condition with long-term management after reclamation requiring minor items such as monitoring, pumping seepage and minor maintenance and repairs for the seepage system and dam appurtenances and maintenance. **Table 4-1** provides summary of indirect costs used for each phase of reclamation.

Indirect Cost Category	2020 RCP Indirect Cost	2021 RCP Indirect Costs Active Reclamation (Year 1-3)	2021 RCP Indirect Costs Post Reclamation (Year 4-11)	2021 RCP Indirect Discounted Costs Post Reclamation (Year 12-100)
Contractor Profit	10.00%	10.00%	7.00%	7.00%
Contractor Overhead	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Performance/Payment Bonds	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Liability Insurance	0.29%	0.29%	0.29%	0.29%
Contract Administration	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Engineering Redesign	3.00%	3.00%	1.50%	1.50%
Scope Contingency	10.00%	9.00%	3.00%	3.00%
Bid Contingency	10.00%	7.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Total Indirect Recommendation	39.29%	39.29%	23.79%	23.79%

Table 4-1: Indirect Cost Comparison

4.4 Cost Summary

Table 4-2 provides a summary of activity costs comparing the 2020 and 2021 SRCE models. As the planned closure period approaches the liabilities for some facilities will be reduced (i.e. TSF cover requirements, concurrent reclamation, or grading). In addition, the reductions and addition are noted above are included in the updated SRCE model. A detailed FA model for the 2020 Reclamation plan can be found in Appendix C of the 2020 Reclamation Plan. A detailed SRCE estimate has been provided electronically for Amendment 1. Figures for the SRCE model are included in **Appendix B**.

Reclamation and Closure Cost Estimate Comparison Table 4-2:

	2020 Re	eclamation Plan Co	sts	2021 Amendment 1 Costs				
Facility	Phase I Costs (undiscounted)	Phase II Costs (discounted)	Total	Phase I Costs (undiscounted)	Phase II Costs (discounted)	Total	Change in Total Costs	Notes
Waste Rock Dumps	\$8,349,884	\$0	\$8,349,884	\$11,721,505	\$0	\$11,721,505	\$3,371,621	Addition of Victoria Creek
Heap Leach Pad	\$3,117,208	\$0	\$3,117,208	\$3,108,537	\$0	\$3,108,537	(\$8,671)	
Solution Management	\$11,314,900	\$925,175	\$12,240,075	\$10,799,168	\$945,917	\$11,745,085	(\$494,989)	Reduction of water in TSF + miscoded Labor rate
Pit	\$214,927	\$27,527	\$242,454	\$214,822	\$27,527	\$242,349	(\$106)	Labor increase
Yards	\$990,576	\$0	\$990,576	\$987,952	\$0	\$987,952	(\$2,624)	
Roads	\$113,630	\$0	\$113,630	\$105,889	\$0	\$105,889	(\$7,741)	Access road under VCWRD
Borrow Area	\$69,385	\$0	\$69,385	\$30,250	\$0	\$30,250	(\$39,135)	reclaimed TSF borrow areas
Tailings	\$9,675,304	\$0	\$9,675,304	\$8,928,476	\$0	\$8,928,476	(\$746,829)	Cover placed on portion of TSF
Buildings	\$3,957,079	\$0	\$3,957,079	\$3,827,323	\$0	\$3,827,323	(\$129,756)	miscoded labor rate in 2020 (too high)
Other Demo	\$596,045	\$0	\$596,045	\$603,918	\$0	\$603,918	\$7,873	Labor increase
Sediment and Drainage Control	\$12,935,352	\$0	\$12,935,352	\$11,351,777	\$0	\$11,351,777	(\$1,583,575)	Eliminated riprap blasting, sourced from screened WR
TSF Spillway	\$2,917,129	\$0	\$2,917,129	\$2,941,852	\$0	\$2,941,852	\$24,723	Labor increase
Linear Structures	\$5,814	\$717,643	\$723,457	\$5,938	\$734,216	\$740,154	\$16,697	Labor increase
Monitoring	\$1,861,786	\$461,170	\$2,322,956	\$1,910,229	\$414,411	\$2,324,640	\$1,684	Labor increase
Road Maintenance	\$215,784	\$0	\$215,784	\$215,501	\$0	\$215,501	(\$283)	
Well Abandonment	\$433,580	\$0	\$433,580	\$438,165	\$0	\$438,165	\$4,585	Labor increase
Water Fees	\$1,650	\$0	\$1,650	\$1,650	\$0	\$1,650	\$0	
Long-term Maintenance and Repair	\$217,240	\$1,766,469	\$1,983,709	\$217,240	\$1,798,945	\$2,016,185	\$32,476	increase in area from addition of VC WRD
Mobilization-demobilization	\$1,805,692	\$0	\$1,805,692	\$1,807,875	\$0	\$1,807,875	\$2,183	Labor increase
Active Reclamation	\$6,544,241	\$0	\$6,544,241	\$6,566,798	\$0	\$6,566,798	\$22,556	increase in area from addition of VC WRD
Closure Monitoring	\$463,600	\$137,101	\$600,701	\$463,600	\$137,101	\$600,701	\$0	
Solid Waste Disposal	\$764,870	\$0	\$764,870	\$765,289	\$0	\$765,289	\$419	Labor increase
Reclamation Maintenance	\$999,060	\$0	\$999,060	\$1,076,021	\$0	\$1,076,021	\$76,961	increase in area from addition of VC WRD
Tanks	\$642,724	\$0	\$642,724	\$626,864	\$0	\$626,864	(\$15,860)	miscoded labor rate in 2020 (too high)
Total Direct	\$68,207,462	\$4,035,086	\$72,242,548	\$68,716,638	\$4,058,114	\$72,774,752	\$532,205	
Contractor Profit		\$605 264	\$10,836,383	\$6,741,350	\$284,067	\$7,025,417	(\$172,226)	Reduction of long-term indirect costs
Contractor Overhead	\$10,231,119	<i>+••••</i> ,_•	<i> </i>	\$3,435,832	\$202,908	\$3,638,740		
Performance/Payment Bonds				\$2,061,499	\$121,745	\$2,183,244		
Liability Insurance	\$3,601,353	\$213,057	\$3,814,410	\$192,407	\$11,364	\$203,771	\$28,099	Increase in labor costs
Contract Administration				\$1,374,333	\$81,161	\$1,455,494		
Engineering Redesian	\$2.046.224	\$121.056	\$2,167.280	\$1,996,342	\$60,871	\$2,057,213	(\$110,067)	Reduction of long-term indirect costs
Scope Contingency	\$10.913.194	\$645.619	\$11,558,813	\$5,923,869	\$121,745	\$6,045,614	(\$839,063)	Reduction of long-term indirect costs
Bid Contingency	÷,,	÷•••••	÷ : ,000,010	\$4,592,975	\$81,161	\$4,674,136	1	
Grand Total	\$94,999,352	\$5,620,082	\$100,619,434	\$95,035,245	\$5,023,137	\$100,058,382	(\$561,052)	

20

Note: See User Sheet 5 in SRCE model. Fort_Knox_Vic_WRD_Amend-1_SRCE_226900_020_v7_20210505.xlsm

Appendix A Victoria Creek Mining Claims

Victoria Creek Claims List

ADL Number	Claim Name	YEAR	Total ACRES
ADL 527312	GD 201	1988	40
ADL 527313	GD 300	1988	20
ADL 527314	GD 301	1988	13
ADL 527315	GD 400	1988	21
ADL 527316	GD 401	1988	40
ADL 527317	GD 402	1988	40
ADL 556913	GD 403	1992	40
ADL 527319	GD 500	1988	10
ADL 556914	GD 503	1992	40
ADL 335294	GIL #694	1981	7
ADL 338432	GIL #6945	1981	40
ADL 335295	GIL #695	1981	20
ADL 335296	GIL #794	1981	40
ADL 338433	GIL #7945	1981	40
ADL 335298	GIL #894	1981	40
ADL 338438	GIL #8945	1981	40
ADL 322336	GIL #994	1980	40
ADL 351645	LAUREL #12	1982	40
ADL 351646	LAUREL #13	1982	40
ADL 337434	LAUREL #4	1980	40
ADL 337435	LAUREL #5	1980	40
ADL 337437	LAUREL #7	2000	40
ADL 337438	LAUREL #8	1980	37
ADL 337439	LAUREL #9	1980	20
ADL 305126	YELLOW PUP 10	1977	20
ADL 305127	YELLOW PUP 11	1971	20
ADL 305128	YELLOW PUP 12	1977	20
ADL 305121	YELLOW PUP 5	1977	40
ADL 305122	YELLOW PUP 6	1977	40
ADL 305125	YELLOW PUP 9	1977	20

Appendix B SRCE Figures





P:\Fort_Knox\040_Drafting\Task_330_Vic_Cr_WRD_Addendum_1\226900.020_FIG_2020_MB_TSF.mxd

