

**Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division**

Five-Year Review

**Summitville Mine Superfund Site
Rio Grande County, Colorado**



Prepared by:

**Austin Buckingham
State Project Manager**

Approved:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Max H. Dodson".

**Max H. Dodson
Assistant Regional Administrator
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation**

9/27/05
Date

**Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division**

Five-Year Review

**Summitville Mine Superfund Site
Rio Grande County, Colorado**



Prepared by:

**Austin Buckingham
State Project Manager**

Approved:

**Max H. Dodson
Assistant Regional Administrator
Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation**

Date

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the five-year review is to evaluate the implementation and performance of a remedy in order to determine if the remedy is or will be protective of human health and the environment. CERCLA 121(c) statutorily mandates five-year reviews.

In addition to considerations of a five-year review, the EPA conducted a Superfund 120 Day Study. As a result, the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation (OSRTI) decided to conduct a review at the Summitville Mine Superfund Site to make sure that the selected remedy incorporated new technology and the most cost-effective cleanup approach based on experiences with proven and emerging technologies. Future remedial activities and decisions will include consideration of NRRB recommendations issued in September 2005.

The State of Colorado has conducted the second five-year review of the remedial actions performed at the Summitville Mine Superfund Site located in Rio Grande County, Colorado. The review evaluates the data collected since the last 5-year review, which was completed by EPA in August 2000. Overall, the results of this five-year review indicate that all immediate threats at the site have been addressed and the remedy is expected to continue to be protective of human health. Though significant improvements to the environment have been realized as the result of remedial actions implemented to date, the final remedy will not be fully protective of the environment until the final remedy components are completed as proposed. Therefore, a protectiveness determination is deferred until either the remedy is complete or additional information is obtained to make a protectiveness determination.

Short-term and long-term protectiveness of the remedial actions will be verified through annual or five year monitoring of the affected media, including surface water, sediments and aquatic life. Currently, the data indicate that the site is stable, though some elements of the remedy have not achieved the degree of contaminant load reduction anticipated. The Remedial Action Levels and Objectives specified in the Final Site-Wide Record of Decision (September 2001) have not yet been achieved because several critical components of the final remedy have not been constructed.

Four Interim Records of Decision for the Summitville Mine Superfund Site were issued in 1994. They are:

- Water Treatment, designated OU0.
- Heap Leach Pad Detoxification/Closure, designated OU1.
- Excavation of mine wastes from the Cropsy Waste Pile, Beaver Mud Dump and the Cleveland Cliffs Tailings Impoundment, placement of this material in the mine pits, and mine pit closure, designated OU2.
- Site-wide reclamation activities designated OU4.

Groundwater contamination within South Mountain was also an area of concern and originally designated OU3. An Interim Record of Decision for South Mountain Groundwater (OU3) was never drafted. Instead, groundwater concerns were addressed through the site-wide Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study and incorporated into the final remedy (OU5).

OU1, OU2 and OU4 are complete. OU0 – Water Treatment is ongoing. The Water Treatment Plant achievement of Interim Effluent Action Levels goals for copper (the ecological risk driver), typically less than 10 percent of the time.

Due to limits of treatment and storage capacity (illustrated in Figure 7-17), the site continues to discharge contaminated water at concentrations in excess of the Remedial Action Levels. The impact of these untreated releases is that surface water standards in the Alamosa River are exceeded on a regular basis. These exceedances have been due, in part, to diffuse groundwater loads entering Wightman Fork in the vicinity of sample point WF2.5 and to release of contaminated water from the Summitville Dam Impoundment and turnout structures during years of normal or above normal precipitation.¹

OU5 Final Site-Wide Remedy is largely incomplete. The purpose of the final site wide remedy was to address remaining threats to the environment that have not been addressed in Operable Units 1 through 4. The site does not pose a risk to human health and protection of the environment has significantly improved but not fully achieved. The primary reasons for this lack of protectiveness (to the environment) are:

- Contaminant load reduction is less than anticipated for some remedial elements, specifically OU4, therefore it is necessary to treat large volumes of contaminated water that exceed system capacity.
- Water treatment and storage capacity is not able to manage greater than average conditions encountered during spring run-off.
- Highly unpredictable precipitation and melt-off conditions.

The following OU5 remedial elements are complete:

- Upgrade of select site ditches;
- Construction of groundwater interceptor drains, pipelines and impact basin; and
- Construction of a Highwall ditch and sedimentation basin.

The following OU5 remedial elements are not complete:

- Construction of a new water treatment plant;

¹ Several sources of acid mine drainage present at the site are not addressed by the Interim Records of Decision. The combination of inadequate storage and treatment capacity and these acid mine drainage sources, necessitated additional remedial action to further stabilize the site and to meet water quality goals, as codified in the OU5 Site Wide Record of Decision.

- Possible enlargement or replacement of an on-site contaminated water impoundment;
- Construction of a sludge disposal repository;
- Upgrade of Wightman Fork Diversion;
- Rehabilitation of Reynolds Adit; and
- Management of mine pool water.

The following OU5 remedial elements are ongoing:

- Continued site maintenance, and groundwater/surface water and geotechnical monitoring on-site; and
- Surface water, sediment, and aquatic life monitoring in Alamosa River and Terrace Reservoir.

The most important of the remaining remedial elements that must be implemented is to acquire adequate treatment capacity and/or storage capacity. Without this essential component of the final remedy, the water management system (storage and treatment) is overwhelmed with 50,000,000 to 80,000,000 gallons of excess contaminated water produced during spring runoff. Also adequate treatment capacity is needed to retire an aging plant subject to increasing mechanical and electrical failure frequency and significance

FIVE YEAR REVIEW SUMMARY FORM

SITE IDENTIFICATION		
Site name (from WasteLAN): Summitville Mine		
EPA ID (from WasteLAN): COD 983778432		
Region: 8	State: CO	City/County: Rio Grande
SITE STATUS		
NPL Status: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final, <input type="checkbox"/> Deleted, <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) proposed		
Remediation Status (choose all that apply): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Under Construction, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operating, <input type="checkbox"/> Complete		
Multiple OUs? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, <input type="checkbox"/> No	Construction Complete date:	
Has site been put into reuse: No Please refer to text description for each OU.		
REVIEW STATUS		
Reviewing Agency: <input type="checkbox"/> EPA, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State, <input type="checkbox"/> Tribe, <input type="checkbox"/> Other		
Author Name: Austin Buckingham		
Author Title: Remedial Project Manager	Author Affiliation: CDPHE	
Review period: April 2000 through August 2005		
Date(s) of site inspection: Continuous throughout the period of March 2000 through November 2004		
Type of Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Statutory, <input type="checkbox"/> Policy (<input type="checkbox"/> Post-SARA, <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-SARA, <input type="checkbox"/> NPL-Removal Only), <input type="checkbox"/> Non-NPL Remedial Action Site, <input type="checkbox"/> NPL State Tribe Lead		
Review number: <input type="checkbox"/> 1 (first), <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 (second), <input type="checkbox"/> 3 (third), <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)		
Triggering action: <input type="checkbox"/> Actual RA Onsite Construction at OU#, <input type="checkbox"/> Actual RA Start at OU#, <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Completion, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous Five-Year Review, <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)		
Triggering action date (from WasteLAN): 08/03/2000		
Due Date (five years after triggering action date): 09/30/05		

Five-Year Review Summary Form, cont.

Issues:

1. Interim Water Treatment Plant OSHA repairs and treatment capacity
2. Non-point source contaminant loading to Wightman Fork
3. OU4 Site Wide Reclamation assumptions
4. Mine pool management
5. Heap Leach Pad reservoir
6. Potable water source for the current and future Water Treatment Plant

Recommendations and Follow-up Actions:

1. Implement the remaining OU5 remedial components as soon as funding becomes available, the most important of which is a new large capacity WTP.
2. Investigate remedy options for controlling non-point source discharges.
3. Revise the site hydraulic model and water balance.
4. Reynolds Adit rehabilitation or long-term stabilization.
5. Continue to explore remedies that might result in permanent, passive or semi-passive control of contaminant sources.
6. Continue monitoring all on-site and off-site remedial elements and affected media.
7. Prior to the next Five-Year Review, conduct on-site ground water and seep sampling.
8. Prior to the next Five-Year Review, conduct off-site sediment and aquatic life sampling in the Alamosa River.
9. Placement of fish in Terrace Reservoir.

Protectiveness Statement: The Site does not pose a risk to human health. Threats to the environment have been reduced but not eliminated. All immediate threats at the site have been addressed. The remedy is expected to be protective of human health. Protection of the environment will continue to improve as the remaining elements of the Final Site Wide Remedy are completed. However, protectiveness determinations for the final remedy is deferred until it is either complete or information is obtained to make a protectiveness determination.

Long Term Protectiveness: Long-term protectiveness of the remedial actions will be verified through annual monitoring, which will be required to continually assess remedy performance.

Other Comments: Until all remaining components of the final remedy are implemented, achieving OU5 Remedial Action Levels and Objectives, and Alamosa River surface water standards is unlikely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>1.0</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>2.0</u>	<u>SITE BACKGROUND.....</u>	<u>2</u>
2.1	SITE INFORMATION	2
2.2	SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	3
2.2.1	MINING HISTORY	3
2.2.2	ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	4
<u>3.0</u>	<u>REGULATORY COMPLIANCE.....</u>	<u>6</u>
3.1	STATUTORY REVIEW.....	7
3.2	APPLICABLE OR RELEVANT AND APPROPRIATE REQUIREMENTS.....	7
3.2.1	SURFACE WATER ARAR WAIVERS	8
3.2.2	ALAMOSA RIVER SEGMENT 6	8
3.2.3	ALAMOSA RIVER SEGMENT 3B	8
3.3	CHANGES TO SURFACE WATER REGULATIONS	10
3.3.1	REGULATION NO. 36.....	11
3.3.2	REGULATION NO. 31.....	11
3.3.2.1	Cadmium.....	12
3.3.2.2	Aluminum	13
3.3.2.3	Zinc	14
3.3.3	POTENTIAL UPCOMING STANDARDS	16
3.3.3.1	Nutrient Criteria.....	16
3.3.3.2	Selenium Criteria	16
3.3.3.3	Sediment Criteria	16
3.4	TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS (TMDLS)	16
3.4.1	WIGHTMAN FORK – ALAMOSA RIVER LOAD ALLOCATION	17
3.4.1.1	Data Analysis.....	17
3.4.1.1.1	SMSS Background Loading	17
3.4.1.2	SMSS Point Sources	17
3.4.1.3	SMSS Non-Point Sources.....	19
3.4.1.5	Alamosa River Segment 3b Load Allocation	19
3.4.2	DATA EVALUATION	19
3.4.2.1	High Flow Load Allocation	19
3.4.2.2	Low Flow, SMSS WTP Effluent Present Load Allocation	20
3.4.2.3	Low Flow, SMSS WTP Effluent Absent Load Allocation.....	20
3.4.3	DISCUSSION	21
3.4	SUMMARY	22
3.5	ENVIRONMENTAL COVENANT.....	22

4.0	<u>REMEDIAL ACTIONS</u>	23
4.1	REYNOLDS/CHANDLER ADIT PLUGGING.....	25
4.2	WATER TREATMENT (OU0)	25
4.3	HEAP LEACH PAD DETOXIFICATION/CLOSURE (OU1)	26
4.4	EXCAVATION OF CROPSY WASTE PILE, BEAVER MUD DUMP, AND CLEVELAND CLIFFS TAILINGS POND/MINE PIT CLOSURE (OU2).....	27
4.5	SOUTH MOUNTAIN GROUNDWATER (OU3).....	28
4.6	SITE-WIDE RECLAMATION (OU4).....	28
4.7	FINAL SITE-WIDE RECORD OF DECISION (OU5).....	29
5.0	<u>PROGRESS SINCE LAST REVIEW</u>	31
5.1	PROTECTIVE STATEMENT FROM LAST FIVE YEAR REVIEW	32
5.2	STATUS OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS FROM LAST REVIEW	33
5.3	RESULTS OF IMPLEMENTED ACTIONS	36
5.4	STATUS OF OTHER PRIORITY ISSUES	37
6.0	<u>FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PROCESS</u>	37
6.1	DATA AND DOCUMENT REVIEW	37
6.2	COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES.....	37
6.3	SITE INSPECTIONS	38
7.0	<u>TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT</u>	38
7.1	REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES AND REMEDIATION LEVELS.....	38
7.1.1	REMEDIAL ACTION OBJECTIVES	39
7.1.2	REMEDICATION LEVELS	39
7.2	EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERIM AND FINAL REMEDIAL ACTIONS.....	40
7.2.1	OPERABLE UNIT 0 - WATER TREATMENT	41
7.2.1.1	Questions.....	43
7.2.2	OPERABLE UNIT 1 - HEAP LEACH PAD DETOXIFICATION/CLOSURE.....	43
7.2.2.1	Questions.....	44
7.2.3	OPERABLE UNIT 2 – EXCAVATION OF THE CROPSY WASTE PILE/BEAVER MUD DUMP AND THE CLEVELAND CLIFFS TAILINGS IMPOUNDMENT [SDI]/CLOSURE OF MINE PITS	45
7.2.3.1	Questions.....	45
7.2.4	OPERABLE UNIT 4 - SIDE-WIDE RECLAMATION.....	46
7.2.4.1	Revegetation	46
7.2.4.2	Water Management Structures and Improvements.....	47
7.2.4.2.1	Surface Water Ditches, Sedimentation Basin and Pipelines.....	48
7.2.4.2.2	Groundwater Interceptor Drains	51
7.2.4.3	Questions.....	52
7.2.5	OPERABLE UNIT 5 – FINAL SIDE-WIDE REMEDIAL ACTION.....	52

7.2.5.1	New Active Water Treatment Plant.....	52
7.2.5.1.1	National Remedy Review Board	54
7.2.5.2	Storage Impoundment.....	55
7.2.5.3	Wightman Fork Diversion	57
7.2.5.4	Sludge Disposal Repository.....	57
7.2.5.5	Mine Pool Management.....	58
7.2.5.6	Reynolds Adit Rehabilitation and Control Valve	59
7.2.5.7	Monitoring	59
7.2.5.7.1	On-Site Monitoring Program	60
7.2.5.7.2	Offsite Monitoring Program	60
7.2.5.8	Questions.....	63
7.3	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	64
7.3.1	SYSTEM PERFORMANCE	64
7.3.2	COST OF SYSTEM OPERATIONS/O&M	65
7.3.2.1	Findings of Remedial System Evaluations made during 2000-2004.....	65
7.3.2.2	Historical USEPA contractor cost summary.....	66
7.3.2.3	CDPHE contractor cost expectations.....	67
8.0	<u>ISSUES.....</u>	67
8.1	INTERIM WATER TREATMENT PLANT.....	68
8.1.1	OSHA STANDARDS AND IMPROVEMENTS.....	68
8.1.2	INADEQUATE WATER TREATMENT CAPACITY	69
8.2	NON-POINT SOURCE CONTAMINANT LOADING	69
8.2.1	GROUNDWATER UNDERFLOW TO WIGHTMAN FORK ADJACENT TO THE NWD.....	70
8.2.2	SEEPAGE FROM THE SDI	71
8.2.3	CROPSY CREEK BASIN	72
8.3	OU4 SITE-WIDE RECLAMATION ASSUMPTIONS	73
8.4	MINE POOL MANAGEMENT	73
8.5	HEAP LEACH PAD RESERVOIR	75
8.6	WATER SOURCE FOR THE EXISTING AND FUTURE WATER TREATMENT PLANTS	75
9.0	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW UP ACTIONS</u>	76
9.1	SMSS WATER BALANCE.....	76
9.2	REYNOLDS ADIT ACCESS	77
9.3	REINTRODUCTION OF FISH IN TERRACE RESERVOIR	78
9.4	ADDRESSING SMSS NON-POINT SOURCE LOADS	79
9.5	MONITORING.....	80
9.6	OPERABLE UNITS	81
9.7	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION FOR THE NEXT FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PERIOD	82
10.0	<u>PROTECTIVENESS STATEMENTS.....</u>	82
10.1	OPERABLE UNIT O WATER TREATMENT	83

10.2	OPERABLE UNIT 1 HEAP LEACH PAD DETOXIFICATION/CLOSURE	83
10.3	OPERABLE UNIT 2 EXCAVATION OF CROPSY WASTE PILE, BEAVER MUD DUMP, AND CLEVELAND CLIFFS TAILINGS POND/MINE PIT CLOSURE	84
10.4	OPERABLE UNIT 3 SOUTH MOUNTAIN GROUNDWATER	84
10.5	OPERABLE UNIT 4 SITE WIDE RECLAMATION.....	84
10.6	OPERABLE UNIT 5 FINAL SITE WIDE REMEDY	85
10.7	PROTECTIVENESS SUMMARY TABLE	86
<u>11.0</u>	<u>NEXT REVIEW</u>	<u>86</u>
<u>12.0</u>	<u>REFERENCES.....</u>	<u>87</u>

LIST OF TABLES

Table 7-1	OU5 ROD WF5.5 Remediation Levels
Table 7-2	Percentage Cover for Summitville Mine Revegetation Sampling Plots and Sections in 2002
Table 7-3	Percentage Cover for Summitville Mine Revegetation Sampling Plots and Sections in 2004
Table 7-4	Percentage Cover of Plant Taxa Encountered in Reclaimed Areas at the Summitville Mine in 2002 and 2004
Table 7-5	Percent of Samples Achieving OU5 ROD Remediation Levels at WF5.5
Table 7-6	Summary of 2001 State of Colorado Aquatic Life Standard Exceedances in the Alamosa River
Table 7-7	Summary of 2003 State of Colorado Aquatic Life Standard Exceedances in the Alamosa River
Table 7-8	Summary of 2004 State of Colorado Aquatic Life Standard Exceedances in the Alamosa River
Table 7-9	Summary of 2005 State of Colorado Aquatic Life Standard Exceedances in the Alamosa River
Table 8-1	Aluminum, Copper and Zinc Load Allocation for Wightman Fork Basin at WF5.5

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2-1	Summitville Mine Superfund Site Location
Figure 2-2	Site Features
Figure 3-1	Alamosa River
Figure 3-2	Site Surface Water Monitoring
Figure 4-1	Sub-Basins and Ditch System
Figure 7-1	Distribution of Dissolved and Particulate Copper as a Function of pH in the Alamosa River
Figure 7-2	Historic SDI Elevation and Water Treatment Plant Rate
Figure 7-3	Hydrograph for HLP Well OC-27
Figure 7-4	HLP Dike No. 1 Inclinator Survey Results
Figure 7-5	Historic Elevation of the Mine Pool and Wells Completed in the Mine Pits
Figure 7-6	2005 On-Site Surface Water Straight Line Diagram
Figure 7-7	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station L 3-1/L-Ditch-TO
Figure 7-8	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station SC-7/T-Ditch-TO
Figure 7-9	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station P-Ditch-TO
Figure 7-10	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station Q-Ditch-TO
Figure 7-11	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station A2-1-TO
Figure 7-12	Historic Copper Concentration and pH at Station A2-2-TO
Figure 7-13	Copper Concentration and Load at Station WF2.5
Figure 7-14	Daily Effluent Summary Statistics for 2000 to 2005
Figure 7-15	Box-Whisker Plot of Copper Concentration at WF5.5

- Figure 7-16 Box-Whisker Plot of Aluminum Concentration at WF5.5
- Figure 7-17 Water Released from SDI & Turnouts vs Water Treated by WTP
- Figure 9-1 Conceptual Water Budget Components

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Community Involvement Plan, Revised August 2005
- Appendix B National Remedy Review Board Recommendations
- Appendix C SEO Inspection Reports
- Appendix D Adit Inspection Report

List of Acronyms

ARAR	Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirement
BLM	Biotic Ligand Model
CaCO ₃	Calcium Carbonate
CCR	Code of Colorado Regulations
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CIP	Community Involvement Plan
COC	Chemical of Concern
DCM	Discharge Control Mechanism
DMG	Division of Minerals and Geology
DOC	Dissolved Organic Carbon
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESD	Explanation of Significant Differences
gpm	gallons per minute
MCL's	Maximum Contaminant Levels
mg/L	milligrams per liter
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan
NOV	Notice of Violation
NPL	Superfund National Priorities List
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
OSRTI	Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation
OSWER	Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
OU	Operable Unit
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
PRP	Potentially Responsible Party
RALs	Remedial Action Levels
RAOs	Remedial Action Objectives
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
ROD	Record of Decision
RTG	Resource Technologies Group
SCMCI	Summitville Consolidated Mining Company, Inc.
SEO	State Engineer's Office
SDI	Summitville Dam Impoundment
SMSS	Summitville Mine Superfund Site
SOW	Statement of Work
SSC	State Superfund Contract
TBC	To Be Considered
TTRMC	Tetra Tech RMC

UAA	Use Attainability Assessment
ug/g	micrograms per gram
µg/L	micrograms per liter
U.S. BOR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
U.S. EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
WTP	Water Treatment Plant
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
WQCD	Water Quality Control Division