

September 7, 2007

Mr. Mike Muirhead
Director of Utilities
City of Gillette
201 E. 5th Street
P.O. Box 3003
Gillette, Wyoming 82717

Re: City of Gillette Long Term Water Supply, Level II Study (MMI # 4323.001)

Dear Mr. Muirhead:


Morrison-Maierle, Inc. and Burns and McDonnell are pleased to submit the enclosed report in accordance with our January 17, 2007 contract for the City of Gillette Long Term Water Supply, Level II Study. Per your request, five (5) copies of your report are being forwarded to Bryan Clerkin, P.E. at WWDC, and five (5) copies are included herewith. Copies of our modeling results are being compiled and will be provided under separate cover. We trust this satisfies the report milestones and deliverables of our Contract and look forward to completing and presenting the WWDC funding application for this project.

We would like to thank you and the other city staff that have helped us prepare this wide-ranging and complex report on such a short timetable. Your cooperation and prompt attention to our many requests has been critical to the success of this report. It has been our pleasure working on this project with you.

We look forward to continuing to assist you in any way we can with this project. We recognize the critical need that this important project fills for Gillette. If you have any questions, comments, or concerns regarding this study, please feel free to call us at the number below anytime.

Sincerely,

MORRISON-MAIERLE, INC.



Carl J. Anderson, P.E.
Vice President, Billings Office Manager
Morrison-Maierle, Inc.
315 North 25th Street, Ste. 102
Billings, MT 59101
(406) 656-6000



Casey Hanson, P.E.
Project Manager
Morrison-Maierle, Inc.
315 North 25th Street, Ste. 102
Billings, MT 59101
(406) 656-6000

QUALITY ASSURANCE





 MORRISON MAIERLE, INC. <i>An Employee-Owned Company</i>	
Quality Assurance	
 Project Manager	
 Senior Technical Consultant	
QA No. 0211-07-12	Office Manager Approval  Date 9/7/07
Project Number 4323.001	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Scope of Services.....	1-1
1.2 Project Location.....	1-1
1.3 Acknowledgements	1-1
1.4 Background Information	1-1
1.4.1 Geography.....	1-1
1.4.2 Climate	1-2
1.4.3 Economy	1-2
1.5 Description of the Project	1-3
Chapter 2 LAND USE PLANNING	
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Land Planning Review.....	2-1
Chapter 3 POPULATION PROJECTIONS	
3.1 Population Data	3-1
3.1.1 Previous Population Projections.....	3-1
3.1.2 New Population Projections	3-3
3.2 Consumption Data.....	3-5
3.2.1 Fire Flow Demands	3-7
3.3 Water Source Demand Projections	3-8
3.4 Water Source Requirements	3-8
Chapter 4 SURFACE WATER SOURCES	
4.1 Introduction	4-1
4.2 Surface Water	4-1
4.2.1 Lake DeSmet Reservoir	4-2
4.2.2 Keyhole Reservoir	4-4
4.2.3 New Clear Creek Water Storage Reservoir	4-4
4.2.4 City of Gillette Waste Water Treatment Plant Effluent	4-6
Chapter 5 GROUND WATER SOURCE EVALUATION	
5.1 Background	5-1
5.2 Aquifer Strata	5-6
5.2.1 Wasatch Formation	5-7
5.2.2 Tongue River Member of the Fort Union.....	5-7
5.2.3 Tullock and Lebo Members	5-8
5.2.4 Lance/Fox Hills Formations	5-8
5.2.5 Madison Limestone	5-8
5.3 Recharge Considerations	5-12
5.3.1 Recharge to Tertiary and Cretaceous Strata.....	5-12
5.3.2 Recharge to the Madison Aquifer.....	5-22
5.4 Source Reliability.....	5-28

5.5	Sustainability Concepts	5-29
5.5.1	Sustainable Yield as Capture	5-30
5.5.2	Groundwater Mining and Sustainability	5-31
5.5.3	Sustainable Development versus Sustainable Yield	5-32
5.6	Examples of Sustainable Development Concepts.....	5-37
5.6.1	Sources of Uncertainty	5-43
5.6.1.1	Uncertainty Caused by Natural Variability.....	5-43
5.6.1.2	Uncertainty Caused by Aquifer Test Interpretation	5-46
5.6.1.3	Uncertainty Due to On-Going Groundwater Level Declines	5-66
5.6.1.4	Uncertainty Summary	5-69
5.6.1.5	Madison versus Fort Union Uncertainties	5-69
5.7	Madison Aquifer Test Results.....	5-73
5.7.1	Wells M-5 and M6	5-75
5.7.2	Wells M-2 and M-4	5-83
5.7.3	Well M-3	5-90
5.7.4	Madison Aquifer Summary	5-95
5.8	Madison-Fort Union Aquifer Comparison	5-100
5.9	Hydrographs	5-106
5.9.1	Wasatch Aquifer Hydrographs	5-112
5.9.2	Fort Union Aquifer Hydrographs.....	5-112
5.9.3	Madison Aquifer Hydrographs.....	5-112
5.9.4	Madison-Minnelusa Hydrographs.....	5-120
5.9.5	Madison-Fort Union Hydrographs Compared	5-125
5.10	Production Well Hydrographs.....	5-125
5.10.1	Fort Union Production Wells.....	5-135
5.10.2	Fox Hills Production Wells.....	5-136
5.10.3	Madison Production Wells.....	5-136
5.11	Conclusions	5-144
Chapter 6	EVALUATION OF WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM CAPITAL COMPONENTS	
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.1.1	Campbell County Improvement District (Sleepy Hollow).....	6-1
6.1.2	Antelope Valley	6-2
6.1.3	Crestview.....	6-2
6.2	Recommended Action	6-3
6.2.1	Treatment	6-4
6.2.2	Pump Station – Phase 1.....	6-7
6.2.3	Chlorination Room – Phase 1	6-7
6.2.4	Iron Oxidation/Dissolved Gas Removal – Phase 1	6-7
6.2.5	Pump Configuration – Phase 1	6-9
6.2.6	System Storage – Phase 1.....	6-9
6.2.7	Interconnecting Piping – Phase 1.....	6-10
6.2.8	System Connection – Phase 2.....	6-11
6.3	Cost Estimate	6-11
Chapter 7	IDENTIFIED SOURCES	
7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Short-Term Sources	7-1

7.2.1	Current Source Improvements.....	7-2
7.2.2	Possible Short-Term Sources.....	7-5
7.2.2.1	Expand Fort Union Source.....	7-5
7.2.2.2	Treat the Lance / Fox Hills Source.....	7-6
7.2.2.3	Utilize Coal Bed Methane Water.....	7-6
7.2.2.4	Expand the Madison Source.....	7-7
7.2.2.5	Develop the Wasatch Source.....	7-8
7.2.3	Evaluation Approach.....	7-8
7.3	Long-Term Sources.....	7-9
7.3.1	Long-Term Sources – Surface Water.....	7-9
7.3.1.1	Lake DeSmet.....	7-10
7.3.1.2	Keyhole Reservoir.....	7-11
7.3.1.3	Clear Creek.....	7-12
7.3.1.4	City of Gillette Waste Water Treatment Plant Effluent ...	7-13
7.3.2	Long-Term Sources – Groundwater.....	7-13
7.3.2.1	Wasatch Formation.....	7-13
7.3.2.2	Fort Union Formation.....	7-14
7.3.2.3	Lance / Fox Hills Formation.....	7-15
7.3.2.4	Madison Formation.....	7-16
7.3.2.5	Coal Bed Methane Water.....	7-17
Chapter 8	FURTHER ANALYSIS OF SELECT ALTERNATIVES	
8.1	Short-Term Alternatives.....	8-1
8.1.1	Expanding the Fort Union Source.....	8-2
8.1.2	Treating the Fox Hills Source.....	8-3
8.1.2.1	Water Treatment Goals.....	8-5
8.1.2.2	Treatment Alternatives.....	8-5
8.1.2.2.1	Treatment Alternative 1 – Reverse Osmosis	8-5
8.1.2.2.2	Treatment Alternative 2 – Electrodialysis (ED) and Electrodialysis Reversal (EDR)	8-11
8.1.2.2.3	Treatment Alternative 3 – Ion Exchange	8-14
8.1.2.2.4	Treatment Alternative 4 – Ion Exchange + Reverse Osmosis.....	8-17
8.1.2.2.5	Treatment Alternative 5 – ED/EDR + Reverse Osmosis.....	8-19
8.1.2.3	Residual Handling Alternatives.....	8-19
8.1.2.3.1	Surface Water Disposal.....	8-20
8.1.2.3.2	Discharge to Sewer/Wastewater Treatment Plant.....	8-21
8.1.2.3.3	Deep Well Injection via Class 1 Well.....	8-23
8.1.2.3.4	Evaporation Ponds.....	8-25
8.1.2.4	Preliminary Cost Opinions for Treatment Alternatives	8-26
8.1.2.5	Preliminary Cost Opinions for Concentrate Disposal.....	8-27
8.1.2.6	Total Alternative Capital Cost.....	8-27
8.1.3	Utilize Coal Bed Methane Water.....	8-27
8.1.4	Short-term Alternative Recommendations.....	8-30
8.1.4.1	Conservation.....	8-31
8.1.4.2	Continued for Union Development.....	8-31
8.1.4.3	Temporarily Treat the Fox Hills Source.....	8-32

8.1.4.4	Expediting the Long-Term Solution.....	8-32
8.2	Long Term Alternatives	8-32
8.2.1	New Madison Well Field and Transmission Main	8-33
8.2.1.1	Existing Transmission Main	8-34
8.2.1.2	Alternative Development.....	8-35
8.2.1.3	Alternative Analysis (Cursory Cost Comparison).....	8-41
8.2.1.4	Alternative Modeling	8-48
8.2.1.5	Alternative Surge Analysis.....	8-51
8.2.1.6	Final Alternative Cost Comparison and Recommendation.....	8-56
8.2.1.7	Madison Well Field.....	8-57
8.2.1.8	Total Alternative Costs.....	8-57
8.2.2	Surface Water Impoundment of Madison Water with a Surface Water Treatment Plant and New Transmission Main.....	8-60
8.2.2.1	Reservoir Alternatives.....	8-61
8.2.2.1.1	Required Storage.....	8-61
8.2.2.1.2	Site Selection.....	8-64
8.2.2.1.3	Reservoir Construction Costs.....	8-66
8.2.2.2	Pumping Costs.....	8-69
8.2.2.3	Surface Water Impoundment Treatment.....	8-71
8.2.2.3.1	Treatment Goals and General Design Considerations.....	8-72
8.2.2.3.2	New Water Treatment Plant	8-73
8.2.2.3.2.1	Process Building.....	8-73
8.2.2.3.2.2	Clearwell.....	8-91
8.2.2.3.2.3	CT Requirements of the Surface Water Treatment Rule	8-92
8.2.2.3.2.4	High Service Pump Station.....	8-93
8.2.2.4	New Transmission Main.....	8-96
8.2.3	Groundwater Storage and Recovery of Madison Water in the Fort Union Aquifer.....	8-101
8.2.3.1	Wasatch Formation.....	8-103
8.2.3.2	Fort Union Formation	8-105
8.2.3.3	Lance/Fox Hills Aquifer	8-106
8.2.3.4	Risk Management.....	8-106
8.2.3.5	Preliminary Feasibility Assessment and Conceptual Design.....	8-107
8.5.3.5.1	Water Source.....	8-108
8.5.3.5.2	Recharge Water Quality	8-108
8.5.3.5.3	Recharge Water TSS.....	8-109
8.5.3.5.4	Hydrogeology.....	8-110
8.2.3.5.5	Well Plugging Considerations.....	8-111
8.2.3.5.6	Core Samples.....	8-112
8.2.3.5.7	Geochemical Reactions.....	8-113
8.2.3.5.8	Biofouling.....	8-113
8.2.3.5.9	Redox Potential	8-113
8.2.3.5.10	Ion Exchange.....	8-114
8.2.3.5.11	Oxidation.....	8-114
8.2.3.5.12	Adsorption.....	8-114

8.2.3.5.13	Dissolution	8-115
8.2.3.5.14	Geochemical Models	8-115
8.2.3.5.15	Geochemical Kinetics	8-117
8.2.3.6	Field Investigations and Test Program	8-118
8.2.3.6.1	Baseline Tests	8-119
8.2.3.6.2	First Recharge and Recovery Cycle	8-119
8.2.3.6.3	Subsequent Recharge and Recovery Cycles	8-120
8.2.3.7	ASR Wellfield Expansion	8-121
8.2.3.8	Regulatory Requirements	8-122
8.2.3.8.1	Permit Submittal Requirements	8-123
8.2.3.8.2	Permit Monitoring and Operation Requirements	8-125
8.2.3.8.3	Treatment Requirements	8-126
8.2.3.9	Non-Technical Barriers to Implementation	8-127
8.2.3.10	Capital Components	8-127
8.2.3.11	Cost Estimate	8-128
8.2.4	Coal Bed Methane Water	8-128
8.2.5	Summary of Cost Estimates for Long-Term Alternatives	8-129
8.2.6	Present Worth Analysis	8-130
8.2.7	Time Indexed Costs	8-131

Chapter 9 PROJECT FUNDING AND RATE PROJECTIONS

9.1	Non-Economic Discussion for Chapter 8 Alternatives	9-1
9.2	Short-Term Alternatives	9-1
9.2.1	Expand the Fort Union Source	9-1
9.2.2	Treat the Fox Hills Source	9-2
9.2.3	Use Coat Bed Methane Water (Short-Term and Long-Term)	9-2
9.3	Long-Term Alternatives	9-4
9.3.1	New Madison Well Field and Transmission Main	9-4
9.3.2	Surface Water Impoundment of Madison Water With a Surface Water Treatment Plant and New Transmission Main	9-5
9.3.3	Groundwater Storage and Recovery of Madison Water in the Fort Union Aquifer	9-6
9.4	Conclusion	9-7
9.5	Timeline to Implementation	9-9
9.5	Conclusion	9-9

Chapter 10 NON-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

10.1	Project Funding	10-1
10.1.1	Funding Sources	10-1
10.1.1.1	Wyoming Water Development Commission	10-1
10.1.1.2	Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) US Environmental Protection Agency/ Wyoming DEQ	10-3
10.1.1.3	Mineral Royalty Grant Program and Direct Revenue Distribution Office of State Lands and Investments	10-4
10.1.1.4	Business Ready Community Grant & Loan Program Wyoming Business Council	10-7

10.1.1.5	Land & Water Conservation Fund Project (LWCF) Wyoming State Parks and Historic Sites	10-9
10.1.1.6	North American Wetlands Conservation Fund Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.....	10-10
10.1.1.7	Public Works and Economic Development Grants US Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration	10-11
10.1.1.8	Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	10-14
10.1.1.9	Abandoned Mine land Public Facilities Program Office of State Lands and Investments	10-15
10.2	Recommended Funding Strategies.....	10-15
10.3	Rate Structure	10-15
10.4	New Rate Structure	10-17
10.4.1	Equivalent Dwelling Units	10-17
10.4.2	Funding Scenarios.....	10-18
10.4.3	New Rate Structure	10-26
Chapter 11	RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVES	
11.1	Short-Term Recommendations	11-1
11.2	Regionalization.....	11-2
11.3	Long-Term Recommendations.....	11-2

APPENDICES

A	Cost Estimates (Capital and O&M)
B	Regulations
C	Fox Hills Treatment Details
C-1	RO Element Specification Sheet and Trail Run Results
C-2	RO Element - Sampling Cleaning Protocol
C-3	CADIX Design Software Results - IX Option
C-4	CADIX Design Software Results – IX-RO Option
C-5	Acid/Antiscalant Product Information
D	Softening of Madison Water
E	National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Maps for Project Area

- F** Modeling Results (Pending)
- G** CBM Letters and Sign-In Sheet

TABLES

2-1	Land Needs
3-1	BLM Study Population Growth Rates
3-2	Predicted Population
3-3	Consumption Per Capital Data
3-4	Project Required Flows
5-1	Comparison of Madison and Fort Union Aquifer Characteristics
5-2	Summary of TDS and Fluoride Concentrations in Fort Union and Madison Groundwater
6-1	Flow Data
6-2	Current Storage Capacity
6-3	Proposed Storage Capacity
7-1	Production Rates – Fox Hills Wells
8-1	Water Quality Data for Fox Hills Wells
8-2	Advantages and Disadvantages of RO Systems
8-3	Advantages and Disadvantages of EDR Systems
8-4	Advantages and Disadvantages of IX Systems
8-5	Short-Term Alternatives Summary
8-6	Alternative 1 Cursory Cost
8-7	Alternative 2 Cursory Cost
8-8	Alternative 3 Cursory Cost
8-9	Pipe Wave Speed
8-10	Alternatives 2 and 3 Modeled Quantities
8-11	Annual Storage Requirements to Meet Peak Demands
8-12	Reservoir Site Characteristics
8-13	Summary of Dam Costs
8-14	Cost Summary for 2 Excavated Reservoir Options
8-15	Average Deficit in Supply at 5-Year Increments
8-16	Additional Required Volume in Gallons at 5-Year Increments
8-17	Regulatory Summary
8-18	Proposed Transmission Main Modeled Quantities
9-1	Timeline to Implementation
10-1	EDU Calculations
10-2	Base Rate Increases

FIGURES

- 2-1 PDB (Planning District Boundary)
- 3-1 Population Projections
- 3-2 Average Monthly Per Capita Consumption
- 5-1 Generalized Geologic Map of the Powder River Structural Basin
- 5-2 Generalized Stratigraphic Column of Tertiary and Upper Cretaceous Formations
- 5-3 Generalized Hydrogeologic Section of the Hydrogeologic Units of the Powder River Structural Basin
- 5-4 Thickness and Structural Contours on the Madison Limestone
- 5-5 Geologic Section with Principal CBM Coal Beds Identified
- 5-6 Coalbed Methane Wells and Permitted Coalbed Methane Well Sites near Gillette
- 5-7 Generalized Geology and Location of Clinker Beds near Gillette
- 5-8 Potentiometric Contours for Wyodak-Anderson coal bed in 1986
- 5-9 Predevelopment Potentiometric Surface of the Madison Aquifer
- 5-10 Generalized Groundwater Flow Directions and Flow Rates in the Madison Aquifer in the Black Hills Area
- 5-11 Predevelopment Recharge and Discharge Rates in the Madison Aquifer
- 5-12 5-Year Average Drawdown for 15 Fort Union Wells
- 5-13 10-Year Average Drawdown for 15 Fort Union Wells
- 5-14 20-Year Average Drawdown for 15 Fort Union Wells
- 5-15 100-Year Average Drawdown for 15 Fort Union Wells with Sleepy Hollow Aquifer Parameters
- 5-16 Alternate Fits of Theis Type Curve to ASR Monitoring Well Data
- 5-17 Cooper-Jacob Plot of ASR Monitoring Well Response
- 5-18 Drawdown Versus Square Root of Elapsed Time for ASR Monitoring Well
- 5-19 Theis Solution to Early Aquifer Response in ASR Monitoring Well
- 5-20 Cooper-Jacob Plot of Sleepy Hollow No. 6 Aquifer Test Response
- 5-21 Linear Flow Diagnostic Plot for Sleepy Hollow Well No. 6 Shows Radial Flow
- 5-22 Expanded Diagnostic Plot for Sleepy Hollow No. 6 Well Test
- 5-23 Tentative Theis Solution to Sleepy Hollow No. 6 Well Test
- 5-24 Calibration of AQTESOLV® Solution to ASR Monitoring Well Test Data
- 5-25 20-Year Projected Drawdown at ASR Test Well With and Without Boundaries and 260-gpm Cyclical Pumping Rate
- 5-26 Generalized Groundwater level Declines in the Gillette Area
- 5-27 20-Year Average Drawdown for 15 Madison Aquifer Wells
- 5-28 100-Year Average Drawdown in 15 Madison Aquifer Wells
- 5-29 Log-log Time-drawdown Plot of Well M-6 Constant Rate Test
- 5-30 Arithmetic Plot of Well M-6 Data Showing Stabilized Drawdown
- 5-31 Cooper-Jacob Solution for Well M-6 Constant Rate Test
- 5-32 Cartesian Plot of Well M-5 Time-drawdown Response
- 5-33 Well Loss and Drawdown Corrected for Well Loss in Well M-5
- 5-34 Theis Solution for Aquifer Transmissivity at Well M-5
- 5-35 Step Test Time-drawdown Plots for Well M-4
- 5-36 Specific Capacity Curve for Well M-4
- 5-37 Diagnostic Log-log Plot for Well M-4 at 656 gpm
- 5-38 Plot of Drawdown versus the Square Root of Time for Well M-4

- 5-39 Log-log Plot of 600 gpm Test Data from Well M-2
- 5-40 Reproduction of J.M. Montgomery Plot of Pre-fracture Test of Well M-3
- 5-41 Pre-frac Test of Well M-3 with Residual Drawdown and Well Loss
- 5-42 Diagnostic Log-log Plot of Corrected Pre-frac Drawdown at Well M-3
- 5-43 Post-hydrofracture Constant Rate Test of Well M-3 at 750 gpm
- 5-44 Table 3 from J.M. Montgomery (1992)
- 5-45 Locations of Groundwater Monitoring Wells
- 5-46 Monitoring Well Locations and Hydrograph Lines of Section near Gillette
- 5-47 Wasatch Aquifer Hydrographs
- 5-48 Wasatch aquifer and/or Fort Union coal bed hydrographs
- 5-49a Fort Union aquifer hydrographs from line of section A-A
- 5-49b Fort Union aquifer hydrographs from line of section B-B
- 5-49c Fort Union aquifer hydrographs from line of section C-C
- 5-49d Fort Union aquifer hydrographs from line of section D-D
- 5-50 Madison aquifer hydrographs
- 5-51 Minnelusa-Madison hydrographs at T53N, R60W, Section 16
- 5-52 Minnelusa-Madison hydrographs at T53N, R61W, Section 32
- 5-53 Minnelusa-Madison hydrographs at T49N, R62W, Section 36
- 5-54a Comparison of Madison and Fort Union aquifer hydrographs
- 5-54b Comparison of Madison and Fort Union aquifer hydrographs
- 5-55 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-9
- 5-56 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-10
- 5-57 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-12
- 5-58 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-17
- 5-59 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-18
- 5-60 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-19
- 5-61 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-20
- 5-62 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-21
- 5-63 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-22
- 5-64 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-22
- 5-65 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-24
- 5-66 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-25
- 5-67 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-26
- 5-68 Hydrograph of Fort Union production well S-27
- 5-69 Hydrograph of Fox Hills production well FH-1
- 5-70 Hydrograph of Fox Hills production well FH-2
- 5-71 Hydrograph of Fox Hills production well FH-3
- 5-72 Hydrograph of Fox Hills production well FH-4
- 5-73 Hydrograph of Fox Hills production well FH-5
- 5-74 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-1
- 5-75 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-2
- 5-76 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-3
- 5-77 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-4
- 5-78 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-5
- 5-79 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-6
- 5-80 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-7
- 5-81 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-8
- 5-82 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-9
- 5-83 Hydrograph of Madison production well M-10

- 6-1 Proposed Phase I Subdivision Improvements
- 6-2 Subdivision Treatment Layout

- 7-1 Existing City of Gillette Water System Wells

- 8-1 RO Membrane (*Courtesy of GE Osmonics*)
- 8-2 Fox Hills RO Treatment
- 8-3 Schematic of RO System
- 8-4 ED System
- 8-5 EDR System
- 8-6 EDR System for Fox Hills
- 8-7 Fox Hills Ion Exchange + RO Treatment
- 8-8 Northern Madison Pipeline Route
- 8-9 Southern Madison Pipeline Route
- 8-10 Transmission Main Alternative #1
- 8-11 Transmission Main Alternative #2
- 8-12 Transmission Main Alternative #3
- 8-13 Alternative 2 – Steady State HGL Profile
- 8-14 Alternative 3 – Steady State HGL Profile
- 8-15 Alternative 2 – Surge Pressure Envelope
- 8-16 Alternative 3 – Surge Pressure Envelope
- 8-17 Madison Well Field Layout
- 8-18 Surface Water Impoundment Alternative Schematic
- 8-19 Average Per Capita Consumption vs. Existing System Capacity
- 8-20 Potential Reservoir Sites
- 8-21 WTP Process with Low Pressure Membranes
- 8-22 WTP Process with Gravity Filters
- 8-23 Surface Water Impoundment – 9 MGD Immersed Membranes
- 8-24 Surface Water Impoundment – 9 MGD Immersion Membranes
- 8-25 Surface Water Impoundment – 18 MGD Immersed Membranes
- 8-26 Surface Water Impoundment – 18 MGD Immersion Membranes
- 8-27 Surface Water Impoundment – 9 MGD Conventional Filters
- 8-28 Surface Water Impoundment – 9 MGD Conventional Filters
- 8-29 Surface Water Impoundment – 18 MGD Conventional Filters
- 8-30 Surface Water Impoundment – 9 MGD Conventional Filters
- 8-31 Filter Arrangement – Filter Operation (*Courtesy of EIMCO*)
- 8-32 Filter Operation - Filter Backwash (*Courtesy of EIMCO*)
- 8-33 Filter Backwash (*Courtesy of EIMCO*)
- 8-34 Clearwell and High Service Pump Station Plan
- 8-35 Clearwell and High Service Pump Station Section
- 8-36 Proposed Transmission Main – Steady State HGL Profile
- 8-37 Proposed Transmission Main – Surge Pressure Envelope
- 8-38 Proposed Transmission Main – Mitigated Surge Pressure Envelope

- 9-1 Advanced Non-Economic Analysis

- 10-1 City of Gillette Existing Rate Structure
- 10-2 New Madison Pipeline Alternative Funding Scenario
- 10-3 Surface Water Reservoir Alternative Funding Scenario

- 10-4 ASR Alternative Funding Scenario
- 10-5 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – New Madison Pipeline Alternative
- 10-6 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – Surface Water Impoundment and Treatment Alternative
- 10-7 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – ASR Alternative
- 10-8 Omitted
- 10-9 Omitted
- 10-10 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – New Madison Pipeline Alternative – Scenario #1
- 10-11 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – New Madison Pipeline Alternative – Scenario #2
- 10-12 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – Surface Water Impoundment – Scenario #1
- 10-13 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – Surface Water Impoundment – Scenario #2
- 10-14 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – ASR – Scenario #1
- 10-15 City of Gillette Proposed Rate Structure – ASR – Scenario #2