#### 12.0 REFERENCES

#### General

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1991. OSWER Directive 9355.7-02, Structure and Components of Five-Year Reviews.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 1994a. OSWER Directive 93 5 5.7-02A, Supplemental Five-Year Review Guidance.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. October 4, 1995. Asarco Globe Superfund Site Five-Year Review.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2001. OSWER Directive 9355.7-03B-P. Comprehensive Five-Year Review Guidance.

#### Site Wide Reports

Colorado State University, 2003, "*Summitville Mine Superfund Site: Reclamation Monitoring 2002 Annual Report,"* Department of Forest Rangeland and Watershed Stewardship, Mark W. Paschke and Edward F. Redente, Fort Collins, prepared for the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, April 14.

Colorado State University, 2005, "*Summitville Mine Superfund Site: Reclamation Monitoring 2004 Annual Report,"* Department of Forest Rangeland and Watershed Stewardship, Mark W. Paschke and Edward F. Redente, Fort Collins, prepared for the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, April 2005.

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR), 1997, "*Public Health Assessment, Summitville Mine, Del Norte, Rio Grande County, Colorado,*" August 5, 1997.

CDM Federal Programs 2000, "Adit Maintenance Scope of Work" June 2000

CDM Federal Programs, 2001 "*Summitville Water Treatment Plant Annual Report 2001*", Prepared for the Environment Protection Agency, Region 8

CDM Federal Programs, 2002 "*Summitville Water Treatment Plant Annual Report 2002*", Prepared for the Environment Protection Agency, Region 8

CDM Federal Programs, 2003 "*Summitville Water Treatment Plant Annual Report 2003*", Prepared for the Environment Protection Agency, Region 8

CDM Federal Programs, 2004 "*Summitville Water Treatment Plant Annual Report 2004*", Prepared for the Environment Protection Agency, Region 8

CDM Federal Programs, 2000 "*Final - Tier 2 Ecological Risk Assessment Addendum for Summitville Mine Superfund Site,* "Contract No. 68-W5-0022, Work Assignment No. 004-RICO–0843, November, 2000.

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), Water Quality Control Commission, 1998, "*Classifications and Numeric Standards for Rio Grande Basin*", Regulation No. 36, December 30, 1998.

HydroQual, Inc., 2001, "Assessment of Remedial Action Effectiveness in Wightman Fork, the Alamosa River, and Terrace Reservoir Below the Summitville Mine Site (CO)," Technical Report prepared for Rocky Mountain Consultants, Inc. in support of the State of Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

Golder RTG, 2005 "OSHA Code Violations at the Summitville Mine Superfund Site" prepared for the State of Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, July 2005.

Knight Piesold and Co., 2004, "*Final Construction Report, Summitville Mine Superfund Site, Operable Unit 4, Water Management Structures and Improvements, Design and Construction Administration Services, Project 8609-K,"* Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, March 2004.

Posey, H.H., Woodling, J.D., 1998, "*Use Attainability Analysis for the Alamosa River Watershed Through 1997*," Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment - Hazardous Materials Waste Management Division and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, April 27, 1998.

Resource Technologies Group, Inc., 2000, "*Summitville Dam Impoundment Investigation,"* Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, September 2000

Rocky Mountain Consultants, Inc. (RMC), 2001, "*Remedial Investigation Report, Summitville Mine Superfund Site,*" Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, September, 2001.

Resource Technologies Group, Inc., 2004, "*Water Treatment Plant Design,"* Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, September 2004.

Tetra Tech RMC, 2004, "*Annual Monitoring Report,"* Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, April 2005.

Tetra Tech RMC, 2005, "*ARAR's Assessment for the National Remedy Review Board,"* Prepared for Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division, July 2005.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, 1998, "*Summitville Mine Superfund Site, OU-4 Site-Wide Reclamation, 1997 Soils Sampling and Analysis for Disturbed Areas, Roads, Ditches, and Topsoil Stockpiles,*" Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Service Center, Denver, Colorado, February 10, 1998.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1991, MINTEQA2 User Manual , Version 3.11, Center for Exposure Assessment Modeling, Environmental Research Laboratory, Athens, Georgia.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1995a, "*Interim Record of Decision for Water Treatment (OU 0), Summitville Mine Superfund Site, Summitville Colorado,*" EPA/ROD/R08-95-095, PB95-964408, January, 1995.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1995b "*Interim Record of Decision for the Heap Leach Pad (OU 1), Summitville Mine Superfund Site, Summitville Colorado,*" EPA/ROD/R08-95-096, PB95-964409, January, 1995.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1995c "*Interim Record of Decision for Cropsy Waste Pile, Beaver Mud Dump/Summitville Dam Impoundment, and Mine Pits (OU 2), Summitville Mine Superfund Site, Summitville Colorado,*" EPA/ROD/R08-95-097, PB95-964410, January, 1995.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1995d "*Interim Record of Decision for Reclamation (OU4), Summitville Mine Superfund Site, Summitville Colorado,*" EPA/ROD/R08-95-098, PB95-964411, January, 1995.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment 2005, "*National Remedy Review Board Package and Presentation Materials*", July 2005

Walsh Aquatic Consultants, Inc., 2004, "*Terrace Reservoir /biological Assessment,"* Prepared for CDPHE November 2004.

Parameter	Remediation Levels at WF5.5 Required to Meet Water Quality Standards at Upstream Boundary of Alamosa River Segment 3c <sup>1</sup>							
	Low-Flow (µg/L)	High-Flow (µg/L)						
Aluminum (total)	5,000	5,000						
Cadmium (total)	2	14						
Copper (total)	$35 \text{ to } 400^2$	1,550						
Iron (total)	25,000	55,000						
Manganese (total)	15,000	22,000						
Zinc (total)	2,800	2,450						
Minimum pH (s.u.) <sup>3</sup>	6.6	5.1						

#### **OU5 ROD WF5.5 REMEDIATION LEVELS**

Notes:

- Remediation levels are estimated for times when the SMSS Water Treatment Plant is operating and discharging effluent to Wightman Fork (typically mid-May through October). Remediation levels are based on model predictions when the Alamosa River upstream of Wightman Fork has a low-flow pH of 4.8 and a high-flow pH of 6.9.
- 2. The model predicts that if the pH of the Alamosa River upstream of Wightman Fork is between 5 and 6 during low flow, which is about one unit higher than the value used to estimate the  $35 \ \mu g/L$  remediation level for copper, then the copper remediation level could be in the range of 200 to 400  $\mu g/L$ . This higher range of remediation levels for copper should be achievable during the majority of the operational year.
- 3. Minimum pH values could be lower depending on the pH of the Alamosa River upstream of Wightman Fork.

 TABLE 7-2

 PERCENTAGE COVER FOR SUMMITVILLE MINE REVEGETATION SAMPLING PLOTS AND SECTIONS IN 2002

Section	Plot No.	Transect			Percent	Cover		
Section	ΡΙΟΙ ΝΟ.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter
North Waste Dump	5	400	18	74	8	66	1	6
	6	400	20	74	2	72	1	5
	7	400	19	75	2	73	1	6
	8	400	6	83	3	80	1	10
Section Mean (Standard Error)			16 (3.3)	77 (2.2)	4 (1.4)	73 (2.8)	1 (0.1)	7 (1.1)
North Waste Dump w/ Erosion Blanket	9	400	16	73	7	66	2	9
	10	400	27	67	3	63	3	4
	11	400	14	75	4	71	4	7
	12	400	26	72	2	69	2	0
Section Mean (Standard Error)			21 (3.2)	72 (1.8)	4 (1.1)	67 (1.7)	3 (0.4)	5 (2.0)
Chandler Groin	13	400	52	44	2	42	1	4
	14	400	51	45	2	43	2	2
	15	400	35	45	4	41	2	18
	16	400	55	19	0	19	6	20
Section Mean (Standard Error)			48 (4.4)	38 (6.4)	2 (0.8)	36 (5.8)	3 (1.3)	11 (4.7)
North Pit	17	400	50	45	2	43	2	4
	18	400	51	34	0	34	4	11
	19	400	23	59	5	54	2	16
	20	400	18	80	1	79	0	2
	21	400	68	24	0	24	4	5
	22	400	71	10	0	10	7	12
	23	400	65	20	1	19	3	12
	24	400	45	32	3	29	2	22
	25	250	57	24	3	22	2	16
	26	400	38	53	0	53	1	8
Section Mean (Standard Error)			49 (5.7)	38 (6.7)	1 (0.5)	37 (6.6)	3 (0.6)	11 (2.0)

Section	Plot No.	Transect			Percent	Cover		
Section	PIUL NO.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter
South Pit	27	425	68	18	0	17	1	13
	28	400	23	75	1	75	0	1
	29	400	54	36	2	33	2	9
	30	400	24	61	1	61	1	13
	31	400	72	7	0	7	3	19
	32	400	25	63	10	53	2	10
	33	400	36	46	5	41	2	16
	34	400	87	7	0	7	2	4
	35	325	38	56	10	46	5	1
Section Mean (Standard Error)			47 (7.9)	41 (8.5)	3 (1.4)	38 (7.9)	2 (0.5)	9 (2.1)
Upper Cropsy	36	400	35	57	5	52	2	6
	37	400	29	56	2	54	3	12
Section Mean (Standard Error)			32 (3.3)	57 (0.4)	4 (1.1)	53 (0.7)	2 (0.6)	9 (3.1)
Heap Leach Pad	38	400	21	64	5	59	1	14
	39	400	28	52	5	47	2	19
	40	400	11	63	3	59	1	26
	41	400	10	69	1	69	2	18
Section Mean (Standard Error)			17 (4.2)	62 (3.7)	3 (0.9)	58 (4.5)	1 (0.3)	19 (2.5)
Cropsy Waste Pile Footprint	42	150	25	42	0	42	3	30
	43	400	20	66	9	58	1	12
	44	400	11	58	1	57	1	31
	45	300	19	54	2	52	3	24
	46	400	4	63	0	62	1	33
Section Mean (Standard Error)			16 (3.7)	57 (4.2)	2 (1.6)	54 (3.5)	2 (0.5)	26 (3.7)
Lower Cropsy	47	400	57	38	2	36	4	1
	48	400	62	13	2	11	2	23
	49	400	16	64	2	62	2	18
	50	400	14	55	3	52	2	30
	52	300	39	44	0	44	2	14
	53	250	30	49	8	41	2	19
	59	400	59	22	0	22	3	15
	60	600	25	64	4	60	2	9
Section Mean (Standard Error)			38 (6.9)	44 (6.6)	2 (0.9)	41 (6.3)	2 (0.3)	16 (3.0)
Lower Cropsy w/ Erosion Blanket	51	350	19	65	4	61	1	15
CDP	54	375	52	43	2	41	1	5
	55	350	56	30	1	29	4	11
	56	400	69	21	0	21	1	9
	57	250	48	29	6	24	1	21
	58	400	42	56	6	49	2	1
Section Mean (Standard Error)			53 (4.5)	36 (6.1)	3 (1.3)	33 (5.4)	2 (0.5)	9 (3.4)

F:\1149\_046\5-Yr Review\Table 7-2.doc

Eastion	Plot No.	Transect			Percent	Cover		
Section	P101 NO.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter
Beaver Mud Dump	61	400	50	41	0	41	4	6
	62	400	71	22	4	19	2	5
	63	350	57	36	0	35	3	5
	64	100	67	3	0	3	1	29
	65	100	59	17	2	15	1	23
	66	100	74	4	0	4	22	0
	67	130	81	5	1	4	4	11
Section Mean (Standard Error)			65 (4.0)	18 (5.9)	1 (0.5)	17 (5.9)	5 (2.8)	11 (4.1)
Water Treatment Plant	68	300	62	18	0	18	3	16
Missionary Seeps	69	320	25	63	11	52	2	9
	70	475	46	48	6	41	2	4
Section Mean (Standard Error)			36 (10.9)	55 (7.8)	9 (2.2)	47 (5.6)	2 (0.1)	7 (2.5)

Data from CSU (2003)

 TABLE 7-3

 PERCENTAGE COVER FOR SUMMITVILLE MINE REVEGETATION SAMPLING PLOTS AND SECTIONS IN 2004

Section	Plot No.	Transect			Percent	Cover		
Section	ΡΙΟΙ ΝΟ.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter
North Waste Dump	5	397	12	51	13	39	10	25
	6	400	26	66	8	59	0	8
	7	446	21	62	6	56	4	12
	8	400	13	46	2	44	2	40
Section Mean (Standard Error)			18 (3.4)	56 (4.7)	7 (2.1)	49 (4.8)	4 (2.2)	21(7.2)
North Waste Dump w/ Erosion Blanket	9	401	18	78	17	61	1	3
	10	390	21	77	5	72	0	1
	11	400	4	94	5	90	1	1
	12	400	4	96	15	81	0	1
Section Mean (Standard Error)			12 (4.5)	86 (5.0)	11(3.3)	76 (6.1)	0 (0.2)	2 (0.6)
Chandler Groin	13	430	59	19	2	17	4	17
	14	381	15	69	11	58	4	8
	15	401	20	78	4	74	0	2
	16	357	31	62	6	57	2	5
Section Mean (Standard Error)			31 (9.7)	57 (13.0)	6 (1.9)	51 (12.1)	3 (1.0)	8 (3.3)
North Pit	17	399	29	60	4	56	2	4
	18	399	25	72	3	69	1	3
	19	395	26	62	11	51	2	11
	20	399	17	47	3	44	4	22
	21	457	64	34	1	33	0	2
	22	391	50	36	7	29	7	7
	23	398	34	57	3	54	0	9
	24	409	20	61	8	54	2	17
	25	252	21	56	7	49	3	21
	26	369	25	72	1	71	0	2
Section Mean (Standard Error)			31 (4.6)	56 (4.1)	5 (1.0)	51 (4.2)	2 (0.7)	10 (2.4)

Section	Plot No.	Transect		Percent Cover							
Section	PIOL NO.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter			
South Pit	27	422	22	54	3	51	2	21			
	28	201	23	63	3	59	0	14			
	29	412	21	57	7	50	2	20			
	30	408	21	70	11	58	0	10			
	31	396	46	37	4	33	3	13			
	32	377	14	75	15	60	0	11			
	33	191	36	50	6	44	5	9			
	34	300	30	54	8	47	4	11			
	35	325	22	67	19	48	4	6			
Section Mean (Standard Error)			26 (3.3)	59 (3.8)	9 (1.9)	50 (2.9)	2 (0.7)	13(1.7)			
Upper Cropsy	36	403	27	70	11	58	0	3			
	37	379	43	45	6	40	2	8			
Section Mean (Standard Error)			35 (7.7)	57 (12.3)	8 (2.9)	49 (9.4)	1 (0.9)	6 (2.9)			
Heap Leach Pad	38	398	26	62	7	55	1	11			
-	39	401	36	53	4	49	0	11			
	40	401	18	45	4	41	2	33			
	41	408	24	47	6	40	2	27			
Section Mean (Standard Error)			26 (3.7)	52 (3.9)	5 (0.8)	46 (3.5)	1 (0.5)	21 (5.7)			
Cropsy Waste Pile Footprint	42	150	57	35	7	28	4	5			
	43	394	32	44	11	33	1	15			
	44	391	27	33	5	29	5	30			
	45	394	25	58	1	57	1	15			
	46	402	8	77	3	74	1	14			
	71	296	11	60	1	59	1	27			
	72	207	4	83	2	81	0	10			
	73	199	10	73	6	67	2	14			
	74	110	28	65	41	24	1	6			
Section Mean (Standard Error)			22 (6.1)	58 (6.8)	4 (1.2)	53 (7.4)	2 (0.6)	16 (3.0)			
Lower Cropsy	47	259	72	17	1	16	6	2			
	48	269	56	35	8	28	4	4			
	49	383	16	55	12	43	2	26			
	50	256	49	22	7	14	11	10			
	52	302	12	81	4	77	1	6			
	53	246	25	47	2	45	2	26			
	59	582	32	50	2	48	3	13			
	60	618	24	64	9	55	1	11			
Section Mean (Standard Error)			36 (7.5)	46 (7.5)	6 (1.4)	41 (7.5)	4 (1.2)	12 (3.3)			
Lower Cropsy w/ Erosion Blanket	51	400	15	74	14	60	1	10			

Section	Plot No.	Transect			Percent	Cover		
Section	P101 NO.	Length (m)	Bare	Total Plant	Forb	Grass	Rock	Litter
CDP	54	364	41	45	6	39	2	12
	55	349	36	40	3	37	1	23
	56	393	49	47	3	44	3	1
	57	252	28	57	3	54	2	10
	58	396	23	52	12	40	2	21
Section Mean (Standard Error)			35 (4.6)	48 (2.9)	5 (1.8)	43 (3.0)	2 (0.4)	13(3.9)
Beaver Mud Dump	61	375	21	71	3	68	1	7
	62	338	48	38	0	38	1	9
	63	349	28	50	2	48	1	21
	64	101	56	39	11	28	5	0
	65	99	60	38	3	35	2	0
	66	134	62	19	1	19	12	7
	67	153	55	40	12	28	3	3
Section Mean (Standard Error)			47 (6.1)	42 (5.9)	4 (1.8)	38 (6.2)	3 (1.6)	7 (2.8)
Water Treatment Plant	68	299	52	44	6	38	0	3
Missionary Seeps	69	320	20	57	15	42	0	19
	70	592	43	44	16	28	1	11
Section Mean (Standard Error)			31 (11.4)	50 (6.4)	15(0.9)	35 (7.3)	1 (0.5)	15(3.6)

Data from CSU (2005)

## TABLE 7-4 PERCENT COVER OF PLANT TAXA ENCOUNTERED IN RECLAIMED AREAS AT THE SUMMITVILLE MINE IN 2002 AND 2004

		Average %	
а :	C N	SMSFS Recl	
Scientific Name	Common Name	2002	2004
Graminoids:	14	0.1	0.1
Agrostis gigantea	redtop	0.1	0.1
Agrostis scabra	rough bentgrass		0.1
Agrostis stolonifera	creeping bentgrass	0.6	<0.1
Alopecurus pratensis	meadow foxtail	0.6	0.4
Bromus inermis	smooth brome		1.6
Bromus marginatus	mountain brome	0.2	0.2
Calamagrostis canadensis	bluejoint	<0.1	<0.1
Carex microptera	smallwing sedge	<0.1	0.3
Carex sp.	sedge	0.1	102 102
Dactylis glomerata	orchardgrass	0.5	0.1
Deschampsia caespitosa	tufted hairgrass	1.9	3.6
Elymus trachycaulus	slender wheatgrass	23.0	21.2
Festuca brachyphylla	alpine fescue		0.1
Festuca ovina	sheep fescue	1.2	3.3
Festuca rubra	red fescue		0.2
Hordeum jubatum L.	foxtail barley	<0.1	
Hordeum vulgare	common barley	0.1	
Pascopyrum smithii	western wheatgrass	$<\!\!0.1$	1.4
Phleum alpinum	alpine timothy	$\leq\!\!0.1$	$<\!\!0.1$
Phleum pratense	timothy	6.5	8.8
Poa alpina	alpine bluegrass	2.0	4.9
Poa arctica	arctic bluegrass		0.3
Poa compressa	Canada bluegrass	0.2	0.1
Poa fendleriana	muttongrass	0.3	< 0.1
Poa secunda	Sandberg bluegrass		<0.1
Triticum aestivum	common wheat	4.4	0.3
	total grass:	41.2	47.2
Forbs:			
Achillea millefolium var. alpicola	common yarrow	3.2	7.3
Androsace septentrionalis	pygmyflower rockjasmine		<0.1
Chenopodium capitatum	blite goosefoot	< 0.1	<0.1
Descurainia pinnata	western tansymustard	$<\!\!0.1$	
Epilobium hornemannii	Hornemann's willowherb	< 0.1	
Fragaria virginiana	Virginia strawberry	< 0.1	
Kochia scoparia	Mexican-fireweed	< 0.1	
Penstemon strictus	Rocky Mountain penstemon	< 0.1	< 0.1
Rumex aquaticus var. fenestratus	western dock	<0.1	< 0.1
Senecio atratus	tall blacktip ragwort	0.2	0.5
Senecio bigelovii	nodding ragwort	< 0.1	< 0.1
Taraxacum sp.	dandelion	<0.1	
Trifolium pratense	red clover	< 0.1	< 0.1
у	total forb:	3.5	7.9
	total plant:	44.8	55.1

Data from CSU (2005)

\_

# TABLE 7-5PERCENT OF SAMPLES ACHIEVING OU5 ROD REMEDIATION LEVELS AT WF5.52000 THROUGH JULY 31, 2005

	L	ow Flow Regin	ne	High Flow Regime					
Parameter	Remediation Level (mg/L)Number of Samples		Percent Achievement	Remediation Level (mg/L)	Number of Samples	Percent Achievement			
Aluminum	5	46	24%	5	31	71%			
Cadmium	0.002	5	0%	0.014	5	100%			
Copper	0.035/0.4	135	0% / 4%	1.55	97	92%			
Iron	25	132	100%	55	97	100%			
Manganese	15	132	100%	22	97	100%			
Zinc	2.8	131	100%	2.45	97	100%			
pH (minimum)	6.6	128	0%	5.1	83	36%			

#### NOTES:

- 1. Low flow defined as period July through April.
- 2. High flow defined as months of May and June.
- 3. Parameters as total or total recoverable form.
- 4. Remedial levels in mg/L except pH, which is in standard units.
- 5. As stated in OU5 ROD, remediation levels apply to times when the Water Treatment Plant is operating and discharging effluent to Wightman Fork.
- 6. Geochemical modeling performed in support of the ROD predicted that if the pH of the Alamosa River upstream of Wightman Fork is between 5 and 6 during low flow, then the copper remediation level could be in the range of 0.2 to 0.4 mg/L. However, if the pH of the Upper Alamosa River is closer to a value of 4, a remediation level of 0.035 mg/L is more appropriate.

F:\1149\_046\5YearReview\Table 7-5.doc

#### SUMMARY OF 2001 STATE OF COLORADO AQUATIC LIFE STANDARD EXCEEDANCES IN THE ALAMOSA RIVER

ALAMOSA RIVER S	SEGMENT No.:	3a	3b	3	Bc	8	9	10	
Parameter	Date	AR45.5	AR43.6	AR41.2	AR34.5	T1A	AR31.0	AR21.6	Comment
	April 11								
	April 19 & 20	> Acute		> Chronic	]	]	[	ļ	
Aluminum	May 26 & 27				ļ	> Chronic	> Chronic	> Chronic	
	May 31								SDI Release
	June 22								
	August 28 & 29								
	April 11								
	April 19 & 20				> Chronic	ļ	ļ		
Iron	May 26 & 27					> Chronic	> Chronic	> Chronic	
(Total Recoverable)	May 31								SDI Release
	June 22					> Chronic			
	August 28 & 29					> Chronic			
	April 11								
	April 19 & 20		< Min	< Min				< Min	
рН	May 26 & 27		< Min	< Min			< Min		
	May 31		< Min	< Min					SDI Release
	June 22								
•	August 28 & 29		< Min	< Min		ĺ		< Min	
	April 11								
	April 19 & 20					1			
Manganese	May 26 & 27				1	]			
-	May 31				1				SDI Release
	June 22								
	August 28 & 29				1	1			
	April 11								
	April 19 & 20				ĺ	Ì			
Zinc	May 26 & 27		> Acute	> Acute	Ì	ĺ	ĺ		
·	May 31		> Acute	> Acute	> Acute	Ì		ĺ	SDI Release
	June 22				Ì				
ľ	August 28 & 29				1	İ			
	April 11								
ľ	April 19 & 20	> Acute	> Acute	> Acute		ĺ	İ		
Copper	May 26 & 27			> Acute					
	May 31		> Acute	> Acute	> Acute				SDI Release
·	June 22								
·	August 28 & 29			> Acute		1			

Notes: 1. "> Acute" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's acute water quality standard.

2. "> Chronic" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's chronic water quality standard.

3. "< Min" indicates that the pH value was below the range of 6.5 to 9.0. Note that the Segment 3a minimum value varies seasonally.

4. indicates that the location was not sampled or parameter not analyzed during the particular sampling event.

5. In 2001, Segment 3d did not exist.

#### SUMMARY OF 2003 STATE OF COLORADO AQUATIC LIFE STANDARD EXCEEDANCES IN THE ALAMOSA RIVER

ALAMOSA RIVER S	EGMENT No.:	3a	3b	3c	3	d	8	9	10	
Parameter	Date	AR45.5	AR43.6	AR41.2	AR37.5	AR34.5	T1A	AR31.0	AR21.6	Comment
Aluminum	May 21 & 22				> Chronic					
Aldinindin	September 17 & 18							> Chronic		
Iron	May 21 & 22						> Chronic			
(Total Recoverable)	September 17 & 18					> Chronic		> Chronic		
рН	May 21 & 22									
pri	September 17 & 18			< Min	< Min			< Min		
Manganese	May 21 & 22									
Manganese	September 17 & 18									
Zinc	May 21 & 22									
ZINC	September 17 & 18									
Copper	May 21 & 22			> Chronic	> Chronic					
Сорреі	September 17 & 18		ĺ					> Acute		

Notes: 1. "> Acute" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's acute water quality standard.

2. "> Chronic" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's chronic water quality standard.

3. "< Min" indicates that the pH value was below the range of 6.5 to 9.0. Note that the Segment 3a minimum value varies seasonally.

4. indicates that the location was not sampled or parameter not analyzed during the particular sampling event.

#### SUMMARY OF 2004 STATE OF COLORADO AQUATIC LIFE STANDARD EXCEEDANCES IN THE ALAMOSA RIVER

ALAMOSA RIVER S	EGMENT No.:	3a	3b	3c	3	d	8	9	10	
Parameter	Date	AR45.5	AR43.6	AR41.2	AR37.5	AR34.5	T1A	AR31.0	AR21.6	Comment
Aluminum	May 25 & 26									
Aldinindin	September 21 & 22									
Iron	May 25 & 26									
(Total Recoverable)	September 21 & 22									
рН	May 25 & 26				< Min					
рн	September 21 & 22			< Min			< Min			
Manganese	May 25 & 26									
Manganese	September 21 & 22									
Zinc	May 25 & 26									
Zinc	September 21 & 22									
Copper	May 25 & 26			> Acute	> Chronic		> Chronic			
Coppei	September 21 & 22			> Acute			> Chronic			

Notes: 1. "> Acute" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's acute water quality standard.

2. "> Chronic" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's chronic water quality standard.

3. "< Min" indicates that the pH value was below the range of 6.5 to 9.0. Note that the Segment 3a minimum value varies seasonally.

4. indicates that the location was not sampled or parameter not analyzed during the particular sampling event.

#### SUMMARY OF 2005 STATE OF COLORADO AQUATIC LIFE STANDARD EXCEEDANCES IN THE ALAMOSA RIVER

ALAMOSA RIVER SEGMENT No.:		3a	3b	3c	3d		8	9	10	
Parameter	Date	AR45.5	AR43.6	AR41.2	AR37.5	AR34.5	T1A	AR31.0	AR21.6	Comment
Aluminum	May 25 & 26			> Chronic	> Chronic		> Chronic			
Aluminum										
Iron	May 25 & 26			> Chronic			> Chronic			
(Total Recoverable)										
рН	May 25 & 26			< Min	< Min					
pn										
Manganese	May 25 & 26									
Wanganese										
Zinc	May 25 & 26									
ZIIIC										
Copper	May 25 & 26			> Acute	> Acute		> Chronic			
Coppei										

Notes: 1. "> Acute" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's acute water quality standard.

2. "> Chronic" indicates that the measured concentration exceeded the State of Colorado's chronic water quality standard.

3. "< Min" indicates that the pH value was below the range of 6.5 to 9.0. Note that the Segment 3a minimum value varies seasonally.

4. indicates that the location was not sampled or parameter not analyzed during the particular sampling event.

### Table 8-1 Aluminum, Copper and Zinc Load Allocation for Wightman Fork Basin at WF5.5

Aluminum (lbs/Day)									
					Contribution at WF5.5				
Month	SMSS Background (Measured)	SMSS WTP (Measured)	SMSS NPS (Calculated)	WF5.5 (Measured)	Background	SMSS WTP	SMSS NPS		
January	0.14		93.7	93.8	0.2%	0.0%	99.8%		
February	0.02		85.3	85.3	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
March			77.3	77.3	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
April		32.4	82.9	115	0.0%	28.1%	71.9%		
May	3.02	51.1	654	708	0.4%	7.2%	92.4%		
June	16.8	55.5	646	719	2.3%	7.7%	89.9%		
July	17.5	36.4	466	520	3.4%	7.0%	89.6%		
August	6.87	44.2	312	363	1.9%	12.2%	85.9%		
September	6.83	52.6	230	289	2.4%	18.2%	79.4%		
October	8.78	47.1	367	423	2.1%	11.1%	86.8%		
November	3.81		332	336	1.1%	0.0%	98.9%		
December	2.33		155	158	1.5%	0.0%	98.5%		

Copper (lbs/Day)								
						Contribution at WF5.5		
Month	SMSS Background (Measured)	SMSS WTP (Measured)	SMSS NPS (Calculated)	WF5.5 (Measured)	Background	SMSS WTP	SMSS NPS	
January	0.08		18.4	18.4	0.4%	0.0%	99.6%	
February	0.02		12.4	12.4	0.2%	0.0%	99.8%	
March	0.08		11.8	11.8	0.7%	0.0%	99.3%	
April	0.41	0.54	16.8	17.7	2.3%	3.1%	94.7%	
May	0.57	0.55	67.9	69.0	0.8%	0.8%	98.4%	
June	0.74	0.50	56.1	57.3	1.3%	0.9%	97.8%	
July	0.29	0.48	49.1	49.8	0.6%	1.0%	98.5%	
August	0.29	0.54	40.8	41.6	0.7%	1.3%	98.0%	
September	0.13	0.65	27.6	28.4	0.5%	2.3%	97.3%	
October	0.38	0.66	32.0	33.0	1.1%	2.0%	96.9%	
November	0.15	0.72	61.4	62.2	0.2%	1.2%	98.6%	
December	0.03		28.4	28.4	0.1%	0.0%	99.9%	

Zinc (lbs/Day)								
					Contribution at WF5.5			
Month	SMSS Background (Measured)	SMSS WTP (Measured)	SMSS NPS (Calculated)	WF5.5 (Measured)	Background	SMSS WTP	SMSS NPS	
January	0.65		8.73	9.38	6.9%	0.0%	93.1%	
February	0.57		7.23	7.80	7.3%	0.0%	92.7%	
March	0.50		7.71	8.22	6.1%	0.0%	93.9%	
April	0.57	0.30	13.1	14.0	4.1%	2.1%	93.8%	
May	6.09	0.32	43.2	49.6	12.3%	0.6%	87.1%	
June	7.00	0.30	39.0	46.3	15.1%	0.7%	84.2%	
July	3.54	0.28	27.9	31.7	11.2%	0.9%	87.9%	
August	3.16	0.25	22.5	25.9	12.2%	1.0%	86.8%	
September	1.98	0.32	21.2	23.5	8.4%	1.4%	90.2%	
October	1.50	0.28	19.7	21.5	7.0%	1.3%	91.8%	
November	1.18	0.36	27.0	28.5	4.1%	1.3%	94.6%	
December	0.66		18.6	19.3	3.4%	0.0%	96.6%	

Aluminum, Copper and Zinc values are in the Total and Total Recoverable Form. SMSS = Summitville Mine Superfund Site Notes:

NPS = Non-Point Source

WTP = Water Treatment Plant

F:\1149\_046\5-Yr Review\Table 8-1.xls