

## **APPENDIX A**

### COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN

# **SUMMITVILLE MINE SUPERFUND SITE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN**



**HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION**

**REVISED AUGUST 2005**



---

**Colorado Department  
of Public Health  
and Environment**



**Printed on Recycled Paper**



**SUMMITVILLE MINE SUPERFUND SITE  
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN  
Revised August 2005**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Section 1: Introduction .....5**  
    **1.1 Purpose.....5**  
**Section 2: Site Description and History .....7**  
    **2.1 Site Description .....7**  
    **2.2 Site History .....8**  
**Section 3: Clean-up History .....11**  
    **3.1 Environmental Concerns.....13**  
**Section 4: Community Involvement .....15**  
    **4.1 Community Profile.....15**  
    **4.2 History of Community Involvement.....17**  
    **4.3 Community Interviews .....19**  
**Section 5: Proposed Community Relations Activities .....23**

**Figures**  
**2.1 Summitville Superfund Mine Site Location .....7**  
**2.2 Alamosa River .....7**  
**2.3 Major Site Features .....8**  
**3.1 Human Health Risk Chemicals of Concern .....13**  
**3.2 Environmental Chemicals of Concern .....13**

**APPENDIX 1: Community Profile Supporting Data .....27**  
**APPENDIX 2: List of Contacts .....41**  
**APPENDIX 3: Information Repositories and Administrative Records .....47**  
**APPENDIX 4: Community Meeting Locations .....49**  
**APPENDIX 5: Interview Questionnaire.....51**

## List of Acronyms

ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (commonly known as “Superfund”)
CDPHE	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
CIP	Community Involvement Plan
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
COC	Chemicals of Concern
EAR	Engineering Alternatives Report
ESD	Explanation of Significant Differences
GPM	Gallons per minute
IROD	Interim Record of Decision
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (commonly known as the “National Contingency Plan”)
NPL	National Priorities List
OU	Operable Unit
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
ROD	Record of Decision
SCMCI	Summitville Consolidated Mining Company Incorporated
SDI	Summitville Dam Impoundment
TAG	Technical Assistance Group
UAA	Use Attainability Analysis
WTP	Water Treatment Plant

# COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PLAN SUMMITVILLE MINE SUPERFUND SITE

## 1 Introduction

The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) Community Involvement Program is committed to promoting community involvement and communication between citizens, CDPHE and other agencies and stakeholders. This revised Community Involvement Plan (CIP) describes the community involvement and public participation program developed for the Summitville Mine Superfund Site located 25 miles southwest of Del Norte in the San Juan Mountains. The revised CIP was developed in coordination with the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8. This is the third revision of the CIP that was developed by the EPA in April 1994 and revised by CDPHE in September 1999.

This CIP was developed in accordance with guidance found in Superfund Community Involvement Handbook, October 2001. The Handbook outlines community involvement requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and as stipulated in the regulations that interpret the Superfund legislation – the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP).

The CIP contains background information about the Summitville Mine Superfund Site, site history and environmental clean-up efforts. It also provides socio-economic profiles on communities surrounding Summitville, a brief history of community involvement activities and a summary of information gathered from one-on-one interviews with various community members.

### 1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Summitville CIP Update is to:

- 1) Ensure two-way communication between the community and CDPHE,
- 2) Develop and maintain open communication between CDPHE, the EPA, community leaders, environmental or other public interest groups and any other interested or affected groups,
- 3) Summarize community involvement program activities that have occurred through progressive phases of remediation,
- 4) Determine which actions have been most effective and which have not,
- 5) Identify and respond to community concerns, and
- 6) Develop and/or update public involvement and communication methods that address community concerns.



## 2 Site Description and History

### 2.1 Site Description

The Summitville Mine Superfund Site is located in the southeastern portion of the San Juan Mountains, in the southwest corner of Rio Grande County, approximately 60 miles west of Alamosa, Colorado (Figure 2-1). The 1,231-acre mine site is located approximately two miles east of the Continental Divide and at an average elevation of 11,500 feet.

Surface water from the site ultimately drains to Wightman Fork and then flows approximately five miles downstream to the confluence of the Alamosa River. The Alamosa River flows past the town of Jasper into Terrace Reservoir. Terrace Reservoir was constructed in 1911 as an irrigation reservoir, which remains its primary function today. Water released from Terrace Reservoir is used for livestock watering, agricultural irrigation and wildlife habitat. Important crops grown using Alamosa River water include alfalfa, barley, wheat and potatoes. The Alamosa River feeds wetlands that are habitat for aquatic life and migratory waterfowl. Below Terrace Reservoir, the Alamosa River flows through Capulin and terminates at its final point of diversion. The Alamosa River is not a tributary to the Rio Grande.




Figure 2-1: Summitville Superfund Mine Site is located in southern Colorado, in Rio Grande County.




Figure 2-2: The Alamosa River. (Note: Segments refer to Alamosa River Segments established by the State of Colorado Water Quality Control Commission 2003.)



In 1984, large-scale, open-pit mining began at the site. Features and structures from that period dominate the landscape (Figure 2-2). One of the most noticeable features is the Highwall, a steep face of South Mountain that was created by open-pit mining. The former North and South open-pit mines were located at the base of the Highwall; both pits have been backfilled, capped and contoured. The Heap Leach Pad was constructed in the Cropsy Creek valley, east of the former mine pits. The Heap Leach Pad has been capped and revegetated. The Summitville Dam Impoundment (SDI), located near the downstream boundary of the site, is used to store contaminated water for treatment. Other notable site features include the Beaver Mud Dump, North Waste Dump, water treatment plant (WTP) and the Reynolds and Chandler Adits.

## 2.2 Site History

Placer gold was discovered in Wightman Fork downstream of the present day Summitville Mine site in the summer of 1870. The source lode deposit was found on South Mountain in 1873, and miners established open cut workings on South Mountain by 1875. The target ore of these early mining operations consisted of native gold in placers and in vein quartz. Early miners drove adits and shafts into the veins to access these deposits.

There was only minor production in the mine area from 1890 to 1925. The Reynolds Adit, the lowermost adit in South Mountain, was driven during this period. The purpose of the Reynolds Adit was to serve as an ore-haulage adit for the upper workings and to dewater the upper workings. A significant gold find occurred on South Mountain in 1926, sparking renewed activity in the district.

In 1934, a 100-ton-per-day flotation and cyanide mill and gold retort was installed at the current location of the Beaver Mud Dump. The dewatering filtrate from the flotation circuit was reportedly discharged directly into Wightman Fork throughout the mid-1930s.

During World War II, the U.S. government mandated the termination of non-essential minerals mining to focus on essential minerals needed for the war effort. Gold production at Summitville ceased in response to that mandate and, from 1943 to 1945, a high-grade copper vein found in the Narrow Gauge and Reynolds Adits was developed. In 1949, water discharging from the Reynolds Adit reportedly ranged from 100 to 200 gallons per minute (gpm).



Figure 2-3: Major site features, Summitville summer 1999.

From 1950 to 1984, the South Mountain area was the target of several exploration and underground improvement programs. Copper, gold and silver were sporadically produced during this period. As part of a program to extract copper from ore in the late 1960s to early 1970s, Wightman Fork was diverted from its original route to the north, and the Cleveland Cliffs Tailings Pond was constructed (later modified and renamed the Summitville Dam Impoundment, or SDI).

During the most recent mining operations (1984 through 1992), Summitville Consolidated Mining Company Incorporated (SCMCI) developed the South Mountain mineral reserves as a large tonnage, open pit, heap leach gold mine. During this period, SCMCI mined approximately 10 million tons of gold and silver-bearing ore, which was subsequently crushed and placed onto a constructed clay and synthetic lined Heap Leach Pad. A dilute sodium cyanide solution was applied to the crushed ore on the Heap Leach Pad to leach out gold and silver.



### 3 Clean-up History

In October 1984, SCMCI's parent company, Galactic Resources, Inc. obtained a mine permit for a full-scale open pit and heap leach operation from the State of Colorado's Mined Land Reclamation Division (now the Division of Minerals and Geology). Construction of the Heap Leach Pad began in 1985, continued through the winter and was completed during the summer of 1986. The initial application of cyanide solution to the crushed ore placed on the Heap Leach Pad began on June 5, 1986. Within one week cyanide was detected in the leak detection system, an indication that the Heap Leach Pad's primary liner was leaking. There were several cyanide leaks/spills from the pumpback system in 1987, for which both the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission and the Mine Land Reclamation Board issued Notice of Violations.

With additional water inputs to the Heap Leach Pad (snow melt and additional acid mine drainage), SCMCI was forced to change its operation from that of a zero-discharge to a discharging facility. In May 1989, the Water Quality Control Division approved SCMCI's discharge permit for a water treatment plant designed to treat contaminated water from the site and to discharge the effluent to Wightman Fork. Because the water treatment plant could not adequately treat the volume of water to the standards required by the Water Quality Control Division permit, SCMCI received approval from the Mine Land Reclamation Division and the Water Quality Control Division to land apply contaminated water on site.

In a July 1990 inspection of the site, the Water Quality Control Division discovered that the land application system was resulting in overland flow of land-applied fluids into Wightman Fork. In February 1991, after monitoring rising concentrations of cadmium, copper, zinc and cyanide in Wightman Fork, the State of Colorado cited SCMCI for violations of water quality rules and regulations for discharging without a permit and issued a Cease and Desist Order to SCMCI. A Remedial Measures Plan was developed as a result of this order. A number of Notices of Violation were issued throughout 1991 and 1992 for a variety of permit violations. At this time, fish kills in the Alamosa River were reported.

On December 3, 1992, SCMCI announced pending bankruptcy and informed the State of Colorado that financial support for site operations would not continue beyond December 15, 1992. On December 4, 1992, the State of Colorado requested emergency response assistance from the U.S. EPA. On December 16, 1992, the U.S. EPA Region VIII Emergency Response Branch, as part of an Emergency Response Removal Action, assumed control of the site. The U.S. EPA immediately began water treatment plant modifications to treat cyanide-contaminated leachate from the Heap Leach Pad and acid mine drainage from the French Drain Sump, Cropsy Waste Pile and Reynolds Adit.

Beginning in the fall of 1993, work began to plug the Reynolds and Chandler adits, which were a major source of contaminated water discharging to Wightman Fork. The site was added to the Superfund National Priorities List on May 31, 1994. Since the U.S. EPA takeover of the site, the State of Colorado, Division of Mining and Geology, CDPHE Water Quality Control Division and Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division have participated in joint reviews and planning related to the interim remedial actions implemented at the site.

Four Interim Records of Decision (IRODs), documenting the other necessary actions, were signed on December 15, 1994:

- Operable Unit 0 (OU 0) - operation of the water treatment plant;
- OU1 - Heap Leach Pad detoxification and closure;
- OU2 - excavation of mine wastes from Cropsy Waste Pile, Beaver Mud Dump and the SDI, and placement of this material in the Mine Pits;
- OU4 - Site-Wide Reclamation.

All of these interim remedial activities have been completed. The actions were considered interim because they were needed right away to help control contamination sources at the site.

In 1996, the U.S. EPA began transferring the lead for certain work at the site to CDPHE. These lead activities include the site-wide reclamation (OU4), Remedial Investigation/ Feasibility Study, Remedial Design/Remedial Action and Site-Wide Record of Decision (OU5) and other remedial investigations.

On December 22, 2000, the United States Department of Justice and the State of Colorado announced that they had reached a settlement with Robert M. Friedland, the former President and Chief Executive Officer of Galactic Resources, Ltd. The settlement provided for Mr. Friedland to pay a total of \$27,750,000, with \$5,000,000 going to natural resource damages, and the remainder split between CDPHE and U.S. EPA for future remediation and operation and maintenance at the site. The settlement agreement was approved by the United States District Court in June 2001.

The Record of Decision for the final site-wide remedy (OU5) was signed on September 28, 2001. Key components of the final clean-up plan include construction of a new water treatment plant; improvements to pre-treatment water retention structures; and management of the mine pool at the site.

In the fall of 2003, an Explanation of Significant Differences (ESD) was issued changing the proposed location of the new water treatment plant and the conveyance of contaminated water to the plant. The proposed location was changed from below the SDI to adjacent to the existing water treatment plant, upstream of the SDI. Design of the proposed water treatment plant was completed in 2003, but lack of funding has precluded the agencies from constructing the plant.

The site-wide remedial action is the final action that will address the remaining waste threats at the site after completion of emergency and interim remedial actions. The goal is to capture the acid mine drainage, contain it in an on-site impoundment and treat water to remove metals to achieve water quality standards in the Alamosa River. The selected remedy in the ROD continues the benefits achieved through the emergency actions and interim remedial actions and further reduces and controls the waste threats. The major components of the Selected Remedy, as modified by the ESD, include the following:

- On-site contaminated water impoundment upstream of the Wightman Fork-Cropsy Creek confluence, with possible enlargement of the existing Summitville Dam Impoundment if additional storage proves necessary;
- Construction of a new water treatment plant;
- Construction of a sludge disposal repository;

- Upgrade of Wightman Fork Diversion;
- Upgrade of select site ditches;
- Construction of groundwater interceptor drains;
- Construction of a Highwall ditch;
- Rehabilitation of Reynolds and Chandler Adits;
- Management of mine pool water;
- Demolition of the existing site buildings;
- 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.

### 3.1 Environmental Concerns

The primary type of contamination at the site, acid mine drainage and acid rock drainage, are characterized as surface waters or groundwaters having a low (acidic) pH and elevated metals concentrations, which result from the oxidation of sulfide minerals.

Many metals including aluminum, cadmium, copper, iron, manganese and zinc are more mobile in low pH (acidic) water. Thus, the oxidation of sulfide minerals at the site provides both the source of the metals and one of the means (dissolved in surface water) to transport the metal away from the site. Metals may also be transported by surface waters in a particulate (e.g., sediment) form.

Cyanide, another type of contamination at the site, does not naturally occur here, but was introduced during SCMCI's heap leach operations. Cyanide was used to leach microscopic particles of precious metals (e.g., gold and silver) from processed low-grade ore. The form of cyanide used in these leaching operations is predominately sodium cyanide. Cyanide ions readily combine with metals to form metal complexes. It is this property that the mining industry utilizes in leaching operations. Cyanide and cyanide degradation products in groundwater are limited to the Heap Leach Pad. None were detected in monitoring wells in the Cropsy Valley downgradient of the Heap Leach Pad in 1999 and 2000.

<i>COC's for On-Site Exposures (based on WF-5.5)</i>	<i>COCs for Offsite Exposures (based on WF-0.0)</i>
Aluminum	Aluminum
Antimony	Antimony
Arsenic	Arsenic
Copper	Beryllium
Cyanide	Cadmium
Iron	Copper
Manganese	Cyanide
	Iron
	Lead
	Manganese
	Nickel
	Zinc

**Figure 3-1: Human health risk chemicals of concern.**

<i>Tier 1 COCs</i>	<i>Tier 2 Aquatic Risk Drivers</i>
Aluminum	Copper
Arsenic	Cyanide
Cadmium	Iron
Copper	Zinc
Cyanide	PH
Iron	
Lead	
Manganese	
Nickel	
Zinc	
pH	

**Figure 3-2: Environmental chemicals of concern.**

In 1995, the Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment resulted in identification of the chemicals of concern (COC) listed in Figure 3-1.

Environmental chemicals of concern were also identified in the Tier 1 and 2 Ecological Risk Assessments. The Ecological Risk Assessments resulted in the identification of the COCs listed in Figure 3-2.

## **4 Community Involvement**

### **4.1 Community Profile**

The Summitville Mine Superfund Site is located in the San Juan Mountains to the west of the San Luis Valley. While the site is located entirely in Rio Grande County, it also impacts people living in Conejos County and throughout the five counties that make up the San Luis Valley – Rio Grande, Conejos, Alamosa, Costilla and Saguache.

The San Luis Valley, known as the world's largest alpine valley, spans over 8,000 square miles at an average altitude of 7,500 feet. The Rio Grande River originates in the San Juan Mountains and flows through the San Luis Valley, which otherwise is a closed drainage basin. Principal towns near Summitville include Alamosa, Monte Vista, Del Norte, La Jara, Capulin and Sanford.

Families in San Luis Valley counties are relatively poorer than those in other counties in Colorado. According to 2000 U.S. Census data, the average median household income in the San Luis valley is \$26,211 per year, compared to Colorado's media household income which is \$47,203. In addition, San Luis Valley counties have an average of around 27% living below the poverty threshold, while only around 9% for Colorado.

The San Luis Valley is also ditniguated by a relatively large Hispanic population compared to the rest of Colorado. Hispanics make up an average of 51% of the county popultions in the Valley, where the percent for Colorado is 17%. Many of these families can trace their families back to early Spanish settlers. Other Hispanic families have settled more recently from Mexico and Central America, although the average of foreign born in San Luis Valley counties of 7%, is less than that of Colorado, at around 9%.

The combination of lower incomes and higher minority rates make the San Luis Valley a

### **San Luis Valley History**

Numerous indian tribes inhabited or regularly visited the Valley including the Apache, Arapaho, Cheyenne, Comanche, Kiowa, Navajo and Ute. Area marshes and wetlands attracted prehistoric groups, supporting a large variety of food resources including fish, waterfowl and edible plants. The surrounding grasslands supported herds of deer, elk and antelope.

The Spanish were aware of the San Luis Valley as early as the late 1500s, when they first began to settle in New Mexico. Early Europeans largely disregarded the area due to its isolation and inhospitable environment. Spanish military expeditions into the area sought to subdue the Indians, but no Spaniards settled there initially.

Fur trappers began passing through the Valley in the early 1800s. The Valley, however, remained unsettled and no trading posts were built. Several American explorers also visited the Valley in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, including Zebulon Pike.

The first permanent settlements in the Valley were established in the 1840s through Mexican land grants. In 1851, New Mexican settlers founded the town of San Luis - the first town in



Colorado. Agriculture was the primary economic activity of the early settlers who produced alfalfa, wheat and corn. The livestock industry began with the introduction of sheep and cattle also around this time.

Mining began in the area in the late 1870s, attracting thousands to the Valley. The Summitville mining district, which began with placer mining, was discovered in 1870. The first underground production began soon thereafter.

The arrival of the railroad in the Valley around the turn of the century brought an increase in economic development and settlement. Among the first Anglo-Americans to settle in the Valley were a group of Mormons, who established the towns of Manassa and Sanford in the late 1870's and early 1880s.

Today, the Valley continues to support a diverse population with a strong sense of history and cultural awareness. *See Appendix 1 for additional demographical data.*

### **San Luis Valley Water, Farming and Ranching**

Agriculture has long been the basis of the economy in the San Luis Valley, and irrigation is its lifeblood. Conditions in the Valley are perfect for raising a variety of crops and livestock. Cold winters and a dry climate minimize disease and insect problems. The principal crops are potatoes, alfalfa, barley and wheat. Smaller acreages of vegetable crops are extremely valuable and include spinach, head lettuce and carrots.

Ninety percent of Colorado's potatoes are grown in the San Luis Valley. San Luis potatoes are recognized as having outstanding quality. Alfalfa is the Valley's second most valuable crop after potatoes. Alfalfa is a perennial crop with a stand usually lasting 5-7 years before being replanted. After the establishment year, it is usually harvested three times per year. The Valley is the major barley-producing region for Colorado, producing over 85% of the state's barley. Most of the barley is malt barley; much of it is contracted to Coors Brewing Co. Three kinds of wheat are produced in the Valley - soft white and hard red spring wheat and durum. Wheat is a cool season crop, producing better yields under milder temperatures.

Vegetable crops in the San Luis Valley produce more income than all of Colorado's fruit production. Vegetable crops include peas, cauliflower, head lettuce, cabbage, onions, tomatoes, spinach, broccoli, carrots, beans, beets and mushrooms. Spinach is a cool season crop grown locally on 1400-1700 acres. Lettuce and carrots are planted in stages to spread out the harvest dates.

While much of the Valley's agriculture is planted and cultivated with machinery, migrant labor is used for weeding, thinning and harvesting, especially for the vegetable crops.

Several reservoirs have been constructed to provide irrigation water for crops. Among these is Terrace Reservoir on the Alamosa River, which irrigates 45,000 acres of farmland on the west side of the Rio Grande valley.

Ranching is an important component of the Valley's agricultural industry. The Valley supports an estimated 12,000 sheep, 54,000 beef cows and 100,000 cattle and calves. Lambs and wool constitute a major industry, as do hogs.

### **Tourism**

Tourism in the Valley is based upon a variety of natural wonders, from sand dunes to wetlands. The Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve, the Alamosa and Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuges, the Rio Grande National Forest, Wheeler Geological Area National Monument are all located in and around the Valley.

More than 20,000 sandhill cranes pass through the Valley in spring and in fall. In March, the Monte Vista Crane Festival is a major tourist draw, as people come from all over the world to watch the migratory birds.

The Great Sand Dunes National Monument attracts over 250,000 visitors annually. Meanwhile the Rio Grande National Forest, covering more than 1.8 million acres, offers many recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, hiking and other activities. Other Valley attractions include a UFO observation center, an alligator farm and natural hot springs.

### **4.2 History of Community Involvement**

Summitville has garnered significant interest both locally and nationally. From the time that the EPA took over the site, there has been considerable concern and attention from downstream residents and water users. In general, community interest has leveled off since the early 1990s, yet community organizations like the Summitville TAG (Technical Assistance Group) and the Alamosa River Keepers have remained very active on site issues. Beginning shortly after the EPA took over the site, community involvement actions were initiated.

#### **Community Involvement Highlights**

In early 1993, two San Luis Valley Information Repositories were set up in Del Norte and in La Jara (see Appendix 3 for locations). These repositories contain information and documents related to the cleanup of the site.

On May 10, 1993, a meeting regarding the Proposed Listing of the Summitville site on the National Priorities List (NPL) was held in Capulin. The meeting was well attended, including 300 members of the public and Colorado Governor Roy Romer.

In 1993, numerous workshops and public meetings were held and fact sheets produced for public information. The Governor's Summitville Advisory Committee held its first meeting in Salida in November 1993. This group continued to meet through 1996.

Starting in 1993, regular Summitville updates have been published at least annually. CDPHE and the EPA have developed and distributed numerous fact sheets throughout the project at Summitville. These have been mailed to stakeholders, available at public meetings and on the Internet. Both the EPA and CDPHE have maintained Summitville web pages that provide site information and postings of site-related documents.

In February 1994, a group of citizens was awarded a TAG grant. The TAG group has continued to be active and organized up to the present time, hiring several TAG consultants over the years. The TAG group has held many public informational meetings and regularly interacts, formally and informally, with CDPHE and EPA.

CDPHE and the EPA held an initial briefing for Congressional aides in May 1994. Since that time several other briefings and site tours have taken place for members of Congress and other elected officials, the last taking place in fall 2001.

In August 1994, the Proposed Plan for the Interim Remedial Actions for Summitville was released for public comment. Several public meetings were held in Alamosa to present the plan and to take public comment. The four IRODs were signed on December 15, 1994.

In 1995, public meetings were held for the Baseline Risk Assessment and the Site-Wide reclamation remedial design.

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) released its Public Health Assessment for the Summitville Mine Site for public comment in April 1997. Availability sessions were held in the community to answer community questions.

In April 1998, a meeting regarding the Livestock and Waterfowl Risk Assessment, the Agricultural Soils Risk Assessment, the Use Attainability Analysis (UAA) and Proposal for Water Quality Standard Revisions, was held in Alamosa. Public comment was taken on both the risk assessments and the UAA.

In June 1998, the Colorado Water Quality Control Commission convened a hearing regarding the proposal for water quality standard revisions on the Alamosa River submitted by the Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division and the Division of Minerals and Geology. In July, a public availability session regarding the final Site-Wide Reclamation Design was held in Alamosa.

In 1999 and 2000, project staff completed several technical data collection reports including the Data Gap Study Report and the Sampling Analysis Report. These documents were shared with the Summitville TAG, other key stakeholders such as the Alamosa River Keepers and the local community through public meetings and public comment periods. The Data Gap Study Report was released in draft form in April 1999 and finalized in January 2000.

In March 2000, the Remedial Investigation Report (RI) was presented to the local community and the public comment period opened. Significant public comment was incorporated into the RI and it was reissued in March 2001. Another public meeting was held and a new public comment period was initiated.

In November 2000, the Engineering Alternatives Report (EAR) was presented in a local public meeting. The meeting not only started the public comment period but also served as a working group meeting; comments generated at the meeting were incorporated into the EAR that was

finalized in January 2001. Another public meeting was held at this time to present the EAR and site status updates.

In March 2001, a public meeting was held to discuss the revised RI and open the public comment period. Later in April of 2001, a public meeting was held to discuss the Feasibility Study (FS) and begin its public comment period.

In May and June of 2001, public meetings were held to discuss and receive comments on the Proposed Plan. The public comment period was extended through August 2001. In September 2001, the FS, RI and the Record of Decision for the Summitville Mine Final Site-Wide Remedy Operable Unit 5 were all finalized. Public comment periods were held for all three final documents.

Since the issuance of the ROD in 2001, the regulatory agencies have held at least two public meetings in the San Luis Valley every year. One of these meetings is typically held in the Valley in the spring, and the other at the Summitville Site in the fall.

In the fall of 2003, an Explanation of Significant Difference (ESD) was issued and several public meetings were held.

For 2005, the Summitville project staff will hold two public meetings again, hold a congressional tour of the site and publish the Summitville Update. Other community involvement activities will be undertaken based upon need.

#### **4.3 Community Interviews**

During the week of September 20, 2004, representatives from the EPA and CDPHE conducted a series of community interviews in the San Luis Valley. Interviews were conducted with a variety of community residents, community leaders, elected officials, local community service providers and local business representatives.

The purpose of the interviews was to learn about site awareness within the community, sources of information on Summitville, and concerns about environmental cleanup and community involvement.

##### **Site Awareness**

All interviewees were aware of the cleanup at Summitville. The majority of the interviewees had a moderate level of awareness and the minority were either minimally aware or had a high degree of awareness.

The majority of those interviewed said they learned about Summitville when SCMCI informed the State of Colorado that financial support for site operations would not continue and the EPA assumed control of the site in December 1992. A small number said they were aware of Summitville before it became a Superfund site, during the time that it was being actively mined.

### **Sources of information on Summitville**

The majority indicated that their primary source of information about Summitville were agency fact sheets and newsletters. Other responses included attending meetings, through word of mouth, through the TAG group and the media.

Other responses were unique such as being a witness for the State Attorney General's Office, being on the local Conservancy District Board or the Terrace Reservoir Board. In each of these situations, the interviewee was actively involved with and aware of the mining activity at Summitville and noticed problems with water quality.

### **Are environmental problems being adequately addressed?**

Nearly all of the interviewees believe that the environmental problems at Summitville are being adequately addressed. Numerous stakeholders further noted that they believed an adequate, even a "darn good" job is being done given the circumstances. They noted the magnitude of the problem, difficult funding issues, politics, government bureaucracy, little or no human health risk and a small drainage basin with predominately agricultural use. While most felt satisfied with the work, numerous concerns were raised which are summarized in the following section.

### **Community Concerns**

The majority of community concerns relate to three issues: 1) water quality, 2) funding issues and 3) location of the proposed water treatment plant.

#### **Water Quality**

A common comment was that people wanted the Alamosa River returned to conditions before open-pit mining at Summitville. One interviewee summed up this feeling by saying that he wants the water discharged into the Alamosa "as clean as possible." Several interviewees noted that concentrating on Summitville alone would not solve the problem of water contamination, since the overall geology of the area is contributing to the problem.

A number of people said they worry about above-average snowpack and untreated releases from overwhelmed existing facilities. Another concern voiced was the ability to meet water quality standards in the Alamosa River and regulatory changes of the water quality standards. One interviewee said that changing of water quality standards by CDPHE is like the "fox guarding the hen house."

#### **Funding Issues**

Interviewees who were aware of the funding issues related to the proposed water treatment plant indicated that this was a major concern. Interviewees said they were concerned whether the proposed water treatment plant would ever get built due to lack of funding.

While nearly all funding concerns centered on the proposed water treatment plant, one stakeholder said that he believed too much had been spent on Summitville, that the cleanup was "overdone," and that water didn't need to be treated in perpetuity.

### **Proposed Water Treatment Plant**

People were concerned about the new treatment plant's design and placement, and the electricity costs of pumping water from the SDI to the proposed WTP. Several interviewees specifically said they preferred to have a gravity-fed water treatment plant. One interviewee specifically said he worried that electricity costs to pump water to the proposed water treatment plant would be prohibitively expensive and stop or force the disruptions in water treatment.

### **River Restoration**

The majority of interviewees said they feel that conditions in the Alamosa River have improved due to the work at Summitville. They point to water quality improvements in pH, metals reduction, coloration, sediment load reductions and improved aquatic life. Terrace Reservoir recently supported a stock of trout until it was drained for repair work.

River restoration was another area that interviewees generally noted as a concern. Concerns related to restoration included reducing sediment loading from Wightman Fork and other tributaries, reducing pollution loading from non-point sources, controlling bank erosion and improving aquatic life habitat.

Other concerns mentioned by interviewees included flow rate reductions and water quantity, the River being dry for nine months, not being able to get water to head gates, falling water tables in the Valley and the reintroduction of fish in the Alamosa. Reintroduction of fish has been a long time goal of the local community. One interviewee summed up this sentiment by saying that "we should return the river to what it was long ago, for future generations - my grandchildren - to be able to fish and hunt."

### **Community/Agency Communication**

Most interviewees indicated they are satisfied with the information they receive from the agencies. For the majority, the annual Summitville Update newsletter and fact sheets developed by CDPHE and the EPA are their primary information sources about the site. Currently, the Summitville mailing list contains more than 400 recipients and is used to mail newsletters, fact sheets, letters and public notices. One interviewee said a local coffee shop was a good place to get information, although they cautioned that it is also "where fiction becomes fact."

Several interviewees said they had concerns about poor agency communication with the local community. One interviewee noted the community was unhappy with the issuance of the ESD and the way the change in water treatment plant location had first been advertised in the newspapers, instead of in a direct mailing to the community. Another noted a lack of information from CDPHE since the ROD was signed in 2001. Another interviewee said that the agencies don't pay enough attention to, or accept the opinions of, the TAG Technical Advisor.

### **Community Involvement**

A majority of interviewees indicated they have been satisfied with their level of involvement in the cleanup at Summitville, even those with little involvement. A number of residents indicated they didn't need to go to every meeting or be familiar with every technical document.

Several people noted that it is difficult to maintain a high level of interest in site cleanup. One resident summed it up by saying, “It’s hard to keep momentum going over so many years.” Others noted that the community has become “burned out,” frustrated and apathetic.

### **Community Meetings**

Community members were asked about the best times for public meetings. The general consensus about meetings was that they should be held as needed, or at least twice per year for the foreseeable future. A few responded that meetings be held annually, or as frequently as quarterly.

People felt that spring and fall were good times for meetings, although May through September was identified as a busy time for many locals. Most felt that meetings should be held in the evenings in order to accommodate the greatest number of people.

Most interviewees said they preferred “keep it simple,” with regular updates about Summitville through the mailing list, including the distribution of letters, fact sheets and the annual newsletter. Most indicated that these mailings should take place as needed or at least biannually.

Most interviewees requested a copy of the updated Community Involvement Plan.

## 5 Proposed Community Relations Activities

The overall goal of the Summitville’s community involvement program is to promote two-way communication between citizens, the regulating agencies and other stakeholders. Additionally, it is intended to provide opportunities for meaningful and active involvement in the environmental remediation process. It also identifies methods for providing timely and appropriate information that responds to citizens’ questions and concerns. The following plan is based on the results of the community interviews described earlier. It addresses the goals and activities of importance to the community. The activities are not listed in order of significance.

<b>1. ACTIVITY: Information Repository and Administrative Record</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	Continue to make available to the public documents relating to clean-up decisions and designs, site history and other documents available for public comment.
<i>Method:</i>	<p>Information repositories are located at the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• U.S. Department of Agriculture, Conejos County Natural Resources Conservation Service Center, 15 Spruce, La Jara, CO 81140</li> <li>• Del Norte Public Library, 790 Grand Ave., Del Norte, CO 81132</li> </ul> <p>In addition, administrative records are located at the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EPA Superfund Records Center, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8, 999 18th St., Suite 300, Denver, CO 80202. Monday – Friday 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.</li> <li>• CDPHE Records Center, Colorado Department of Public Health &amp; Environment, Hazardous Materials &amp; Waste Management Division, 4300 Cherry Creek Drive South, Room B-215, Denver, CO 80246-1530. Monday – Friday 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.</li> </ul>
<i>Timing:</i>	The information repositories were established in 1993. They will remain open until cleanup is complete.
<b>2. ACTIVITY: Respond promptly to inquiries from local residents, public officials, community groups, community leaders and the media</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To maintain two-way communication between stakeholders and the CDPHE, EPA and the Summitville TAG.
<i>Method:</i>	Written or verbal responses, public and/or advisory board meetings, access to Summitville’s information repositories and administrative records and EPA’s Superfund Records Center provide the basis for prompt responses. Community involvement staff ensures a response is received in a timely manner.
<i>Timing:</i>	Responses to inquiries are coordinated as soon as possible.
<b>3. ACTIVITY: Publish public notices/public comment period</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To give the community an opportunity to review and comment on various Summitville technical and design documents.



<i>Method:</i>	Public notices are printed in the Alamosa Valley Courier and other newspapers as needed, including as the Monte Vista Journal, the Del Norte Prospector and the Denver Post. The public notices announce the availability of the document, duration of the public comment period (minimum of 30 days with an extension upon request), contain information about the project or issue, list where to find more information and a point of contact for comments. This information also is posted on the CDPHE and EPA web sites.
<i>Timing:</i>	Comment periods will be announced as appropriate.
<b>4. ACTIVITY: Conduct public meetings</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	Inform stakeholders about cleanup-related issues and to receive community input that can be used by the regulatory agencies in the decision-making process
<i>Method:</i>	To ensure public meetings are convenient for residents to attend, they are held in the evenings or on weekends and in the San Luis Valley. Comment cards are made available to the public. The public will be notified through mailings and notices in local media in advance.
<i>Timing:</i>	As needed
<b>5. ACTIVITY: Support the Summitville TAG</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	Continue to support the Summitville TAG in its role as an advisory board and conduit to the community. Receive input about clean-up designs, design changes and the clean-up progress.
<i>Method:</i>	The EPA and CDPHE will continue to provide grant monies to the TAG, the services of a Technical Advisor and the opportunity to provide input to the regulatory agencies. TAG members share information with residents within their community.
<i>Timing:</i>	TAG meetings have been held regularly; more recently on an as-needed basis.
<b>6. ACTIVITY: Continue distributing an annual update newsletter</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide information to the community about current clean-up projects, overall site conditions and project status.
<i>Method:</i>	The distribution of Summitville Update and Summitville mailing list will continue. The Update will be sent to the mailing list. The Update is posted on CDPHE's web site.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>7. ACTIVITY: Provide timely and appropriate information to the local community about upcoming site activities, clean-up projects and public events</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide opportunities for meaningful and active community involvement by providing current information to stakeholders.
<i>Method:</i>	Provide information through fact sheets, the CDPHE and EPA web sites, the annual newsletter, hosting and attending community meetings, hosting on-site events, distributing press releases to local media outlets, posting information in local newspapers and providing presentations to local community groups about Summitville upon request. When possible, preference will be given to direct communication with the community over notices in newspapers.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing

<b>8. ACTIVITY: Provide timely and appropriate information to local media of upcoming issues and site milestones on a regular basis</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide the media with current and accurate information that can be disseminated to the community.
<i>Method:</i>	Send media news releases, invite the media on-site and continue to develop productive relationships with the media to ensure accurate coverage of site information.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>9. ACTIVITY: Provide timely and appropriate information to members of Congress, State legislators and local elected officials about site status</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide elected officials with site status updates.
<i>Method:</i>	Provide information through fact sheets, the annual newsletter, direct mailing, phone calls and periodic on-site tours.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>10. ACTIVITY: Revise the Community Involvement Plan</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To identify and address community needs, issues and/or concerns regarding the site cleanup that are not currently addressed in this CIP.
<i>Method:</i>	The revised CIP is based on community interviews and other comments received at public meetings or through letter, phone or email.
<i>Timing:</i>	The CIP will be revised every five years or as needed.
<b>11. ACTIVITY: Responsiveness Summaries</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To summarize comments received during comment periods or public meetings, to document how the agencies considered those comments and to provide responses to comments.
<i>Method:</i>	A responsiveness summary is prepared containing a summary of comments and responses.
<i>Timing:</i>	The responsiveness summary is finalized as soon as possible after the public comment period has closed.
<b>12. ACTIVITY: Maintain CDPHE's and EPA's web sites</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide the public with electronic information about Summitville.
<i>Method:</i>	The Summitville web sites contain public outreach information such as the annual newsletter, key contacts, events or public meetings and how to become involved at Summitville. The web site includes historical, current cleanup and site status information.
<i>Timing:</i>	Ongoing
<b>13. ACTIVITY: Five Year Review Public Involvement</b>	
<i>Objective:</i>	To provide the public with the opportunity to comment on the cleanup over the past five years.
<i>Method:</i>	The current Five-Year Review should be completed in late 2005. The public will be made aware of the review through public notices and announcements to the TAG and other stakeholders. Fact sheets, public meetings or community member interviews may be initiated at appropriate stages of the review. At the conclusion of the Five-Year Review, the public will be notified and a copy of the report made available.
<i>Timing:</i>	2005, 2010, ongoing



## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Community Profile Supporting Data**

#### **ALAMOSA COUNTY**

##### **Community Setting**

Alamosa County is located in south central Colorado at an elevation of 7,544 feet and encompasses 722 square miles in the heart of the San Luis Valley. The County is comprised of high plains and flat valleys and is surrounded on the east by the Sangre de Cristo mountain range and on the west by the San Juan mountain range. The Rio Grande River originates in the San Juan Mountains and flows through the San Luis Valley. Alamosa County is home to many landmarks including the Great Sand Dunes National Monument, Rio Grande National Forest and Alamosa Wildlife Refuge.

##### **Population and Growth**

Alamosa County is comprised of three cities, Alamosa, Hooper and Mosca. According to the 2000 Census, Alamosa County has a total population of 14,966. The 2003 population estimate grew to 15,126, a 1% population change over three years. The median age in Alamosa County is 31 years, and 10% of the population is 65 years old or older. Those of a race other than white comprise 29% of the population, while Hispanics or Latinos of any race account for 41% of the population in the county.

The City of Alamosa is considered the “hub” city of the San Luis Valley and is the rail, mining, agricultural and education center of south central Colorado. According to the year 2000 Census, the City of Alamosa is home to 7,960 residents. In a two-year period, the population was estimated at 8,422, a 2% increase, and was comprised of 48% males and 52% females. The median resident age in Alamosa is 28 years, with 11% of the population comprised of residents 65 years and over.

##### **Education**

Many students in Alamosa County do not pursue a higher education after graduating from high school. In the year 2000, 83% of students graduated from high school or higher, while only 27% obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher. Specifically, only 15% received a bachelor’s degree and 12 % received a graduate or professional degree.

The City of Alamosa is home to two colleges, Adams State College and Trinidad State Junior College. Alamosa has an 83% graduate rate from high school or higher, and 30% of students obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher. These numbers are comparable to the county average.

##### **Occupations, Employment and Business**

The employment status in both Alamosa County and the City of Alamosa are determined based upon those who are 16 years and over. The City of Alamosa has slightly fewer persons who are in the labor force, 64%, than the county, which has a labor force of 66%.

On both a county and city level, the percentage of persons employed in particular occupations is very similar. Management, professional and related occupations comprise approximately 35% of the work force. Following closely behind are sales and office occupations at approximately

30%. These percentages are figured based on a population set of persons employed in the civilian population who are 16 years and over.

The educational, health and social services industry records the highest number of workers, totaling 29% of the work force in Alamosa County. At 13%, retail trade has the second highest number of workers, while the industry with the fewest workers is information business. The City of Alamosa also has the greatest number of workers in the educational, health and social services at 33%, while the industry with the fewest workers in the city is transportation at 1% of the work force.

### Residential Trends and Economic Forecast

Although Alamosa is one of the youngest of the counties of Colorado, it has become one of the most progressive. It is making rapid strides in the development of trade, transportation, industry and cultural growth. As a result of its mass economic growth, the City of Alamosa, with a population of about 8,000, currently makes up around half of the San Luis Valley's population.

The population in the County has been growing steadily since 1950, and by 2010 is expected to increase to over 17,000 people, or a 10% increase over 2003 estimates.

### Income

According to the 2000 census, the median family income for the City of Alamosa was \$33,017 and the County's median family income in the same period was \$38,389. Both are lower than the median family income for the City and County of Denver (\$48,195) and for the State of Colorado (\$55,883).

### Population and Growth Profile – Alamosa

	Alamosa County		City of Alamosa	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Total Population</b>	14,966	100.0	7,960	100.0
<b>Population Growth (2000-2003)</b>	15,126	1.1	8,422	1.6
<b>Median age (years)</b>	30.6		27.7	
<b>Population 18 years and over</b>	10,898	72.8	6,014	75.6
<b>Population 65 years and over</b>	1,440	9.6	870	10.9
<b>One race</b>	14,343	95.8	7,619	95.7
White	10,654	71.2	5,455	68.5
Black or African American	145	1.0	112	1.4
American Indian & Alaska Native	350	2.3	175	2.2
Asian	122	0.8	76	1.0
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	28	0.2	21	0.3
Other Race	3,044	20.3	1,780	22.4
<b>Two or more races</b>	623	4.2	341	4.3
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	6,197	41.4	3,725	46.8

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000; STATS Indiana; city-data.com.

## Educational Attainment – Alamosa

	Alamosa County	City of Alamosa
<b>Population 25 years and over</b>	8,567	4,173
<b>Less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	8.0%	8.4%
<b>9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade, no diploma</b>	9.4%	9.1%
<b>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</b>	27.1%	24.0%
<b>Some college, no degree</b>	24.6%	25.7%
<b>Associate degree</b>	4.0%	3.3%
<b>Bachelor's degree</b>	15.4%	16.6%
<b>Graduate or professional degree</b>	11.6%	12.9%
<b>High School Graduate or higher</b>	82.6%	82.5%
<b>Bachelor's degree or higher</b>	27.0%	29.5%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Employment Status – Alamosa

	Alamosa County	City of Alamosa
<b>Population 16 years and over</b>	11,324	6,250
<b>In labor force</b>	66.3%	63.6%
<b>Civilian labor force</b>	66.3%	63.6%
<b>Employed</b>	60.5%	56.0%
<b>Unemployed</b>	5.8%	7.6%
<b>Armed Forces</b>	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Not in labor force</b>	33.7%	36.4%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Occupation - Alamosa

	Alamosa County	City of Alamosa
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	6,849	3,499
<b>Management, professional, &amp; related occupations</b>	34.6%	35.2%
<b>Service occupations</b>	14.5%	16.4%
<b>Sales &amp; office occupations</b>	28.1%	30.4%
<b>Farming, fishing, &amp; forestry occupations</b>	3.8%	3.2%
<b>Construction, extraction, &amp; maintenance occupations</b>	10.5%	7.6%
<b>Production, transportation, &amp; material moving occupations</b>	8.5%	7.2%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Business/Industry - Alamosa

	Alamosa County	City of Alamosa
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	6,849	3,499
<b>Agriculture, forestry, fishing &amp; hunting, and mining</b>	6.5%	2.7%
<b>Construction</b>	7.7%	6.6%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	2.9%	2.7%
<b>Wholesale trade</b>	3.1%	2.4%
<b>Retail trade</b>	12.6%	13.5%
<b>Transportation &amp; warehousing, and utilities</b>	3.6%	1.4%
<b>Information</b>	2.2%	2.3%
<b>Finance, insurance, real estate, &amp; rental and leasing</b>	6.7%	7.3%
<b>Professional, scientific, management, administrative, &amp; waste management services</b>	4.9%	4.7%
<b>Educational, health &amp; social services</b>	28.5%	33.1%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation &amp; food services</b>	10.6%	12.7%
<b>Other services (except public administration)</b>	4.7%	4.3%
<b>Public administration</b>	6.1%	6.4%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Population Trends – Alamosa County

	Population 1950	Population 2000	Population 2003	Population Forecast 2010	Percentage Change 2003-2010
Alamosa County	10,531	14,966	15,545	17,066	9.8%

San Luis Valley Development Resources Group

## **CONEJOS COUNTY**

### **Community Setting**

Conejos County extends from the Rio Grande River westward to the Continental Divide and borders New Mexico to the south. It has an area of approximately 825,446 acres, and nearly half of the area is at an average elevation of 7,700 feet. Only about 34 percent of Conejos County is privately owned, the other 66 percent are National Forest, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) or state lands. The Town of Capulin still contains remnants of the early Spanish architecture that defined the city. However, Capulin has taken to modernizing a majority of the city over the years. The town of La Jara is home to the Conejos County Hospital, the Conejos County Library and the county's only newspaper, the Conejos County Citizen.

### **Population and Growth**

Conejos County is comprised of seven towns: Antonito, Capulin, Conejos, La Jara, Manassa, Romeo and Sanford. According to the 2000 Census, Conejos County has a total population of 8,400. The 2003 population estimate grew to 8,403, only a nominal population change from the year 2000 to the 2003. The median age in Conejos County is 34 years, of which 15% of the population is 65 years old and over. Those of a race other than white comprise 27% of the population, while Hispanics or Latinos of any race account for 59% of the population in the county.

According to the year 2000 Census, the City of Capulin is home to 149 residents. The median resident age in Capulin is 31 years, with 8% of the population comprised of residents 65 years and over.

La Jara had a population of 877 according to the year 2000 census. The median age in La Jara was 35 years, of which 12% of the population is 65 years old and over.

### **Education**

In Conejos County, many students do not pursue a higher education after graduating from high school. In 2000, 72% of students graduated from high school or higher, while only 14% obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. Specifically, only 9% received a bachelor's degree and 5% received a graduate or professional degree.

Capulin has a 62% graduate rate from high school or higher, and only 5% of students obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. These numbers are lower than the county average.

The City of La Jara has a 76% graduate rate from high school or higher, and only 13% of students obtained a bachelor's degree or higher.

### **Occupations, Employment and Business**

The employment status in Conejos County, and the cities of Capulin and La Jara are determined based upon those that are 16 years and over. The City of Capulin has the lowest percentage of persons who are in the labor force at 51%, followed by the county at 55%. La Jara has the largest percentage of persons in the labor force at 61%.



On a county level, the largest percentage of workers is employed in management, professional and related occupations. Sales and office workers follow closely at 22%, while farming, fishing and forestry occupations are the least populated with 5% of the population in these occupations. An overwhelming majority of workers in Capulin are in the production, transportation and material moving occupations. In La Jara, the most common occupations are sales and office occupations.

In both Conejos County, and the City of La Jara, the industries with the most workers are the educational, health and social services industries, representing 27% of the employed population in Conejos County and 25% in the City of La Jara. The most populated industry in Capulin as of the year 2000 was transportation, warehousing and utilities as 28%, which was followed closely by the retail trade industry at 26% of the working population.

**Residential Trends and Economic Forecast**

At various times throughout its existence, Conejos County has been a thriving area. The current economic crunch has in large part been caused by the demise of the fresh pea industry. Before the development of frozen food packaging and shipping methods, the County produced a major portion of the fresh English peas for eastern markets. The community did not shift with demands, and as a result, the economic forecast of the County declined as well.

The County is slowly turning around its lackluster economy. As of late, progress has been made in agriculture and tourism in the County. Vacation and retirement homes are becoming popular in the area and there is potential for a water impoundment project, which would create an ideal area for water skiing, fishing and cruising. Recently, the county has also made efforts to advertise its attributes.

Although Conejos County saw a decline in residents from 1950 until 2000, the population is now slowly growing. The county saw a 13% increase in residents from 1990 – 2000, and a 5% increase in population is expected from 2003 – 2010.

**Income**

According to the 2000 census, the median family income for the City of La Jara was \$29,643 and the County’s median family income in the same period was \$29,066. Both are lower than the median family income for the City and County of Denver (\$48,195) and for the State of Colorado (\$55,883).

**Population and Growth Profile – Conejos County**

	Conejos County		City of Capulin		Town of La Jara	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Total Population</b>	8,400	100.0	149	100.0	877	100.0
<b>Population Growth (2000-2003)</b>	8,403	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Median age (years)</b>	34.2	-	31.1	-	35.0	-
<b>Population 18 years and over</b>	5,701	67.9	95	63.8	600	68.4
<b>Population 65 years and over</b>	1,258	15.0	12	8.1	106	12.1
<b>One Race</b>	8,097	96.4	146	98.0	853	97.3
White	6,112	72.8	67	45.0	590	67.3
Black or African American	18	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.1
American Indian & Alaska	142	1.7	7	4.7	25	2.9

<b>Native</b>						
<b>Asian</b>	13	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</b>	6	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Other Race</b>	1,806	21.5	72	48.3	237	27.0
<b>Two or more races</b>	303	3.6	3	2.0	24	2.7
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	4,949	58.9	119	79.9	552	62.9

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000; STATS Indiana; city-data.com.

### Educational Attainment – Conejos County

	<b>Conejos County</b>	<b>City of Capulin</b>	<b>Town of La Jara</b>
<b>Population 25 years and over</b>	4,979	123	533
<b>Less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	15.5%	32.5%	14.6%
<b>9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade, no diploma</b>	12.4%	5.7%	9.4%
<b>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</b>	33.8%	47.2%	36.4%
<b>Some college, no degree</b>	19.6%	9.8%	20.1%
<b>Associate degree</b>	4.2%	0.0%	6.2%
<b>Bachelor's degree</b>	9.0%	0.0%	6.8%
<b>Graduate or professional degree</b>	5.4%	4.9%	6.6%
<b>High School Graduate or higher</b>	72.1%	61.8%	76.0%
<b>Bachelor's degree or higher</b>	14.4%	4.9%	13.3%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

### Employment Status – Conejos County

	<b>Conejos County</b>	<b>City of Capulin</b>	<b>Town of La Jara</b>
<b>Population 16 years and over</b>	6,035	149	635
<b>In labor force</b>	55.1%	51.0%	61.1%
<b>Civilian labor force</b>	55.1%	51.0%	61.1%
<b>Employed</b>	51.8%	51.0%	57.8%
<b>Unemployed</b>	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%
<b>Armed Forces</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Not in labor force</b>	44.9%	49.0%	38.9%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

### Occupation – Conejos County

	<b>Conejos County</b>	<b>City of Capulin</b>	<b>Town of La Jara</b>
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	3,125	76	367
<b>Management, professional, &amp; related occupations</b>	27.5%	7.9%	28.1%
<b>Service occupations</b>	14.5%	0.0%	14.2%
<b>Sales &amp; office occupations</b>	22.2%	22.4%	30.8%

<b>Farming, fishing, &amp; forestry occupations</b>	5.3%	0.0%	3.8%
<b>Construction, extraction, &amp; maintenance occupations</b>	14.9%	6.6%	12.3%
<b>Production, transportation, &amp; material moving occupations</b>	15.7%	63.2%	10.9%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

### Business/Industry – Conejos County

	<b>Conejos County</b>	<b>City of Capulin</b>	<b>Town of La Jara</b>
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	3,125	76	367
<b>Agriculture, forestry, fishing &amp; hunting, and mining</b>	14.6%	0.0%	5.2%
<b>Construction</b>	9.2%	6.6%	9.3%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	5.3%	9.2%	4.1%
<b>Wholesale trade</b>	2.1%	0.0%	2.7%
<b>Retail trade</b>	12.4%	26.3%	19.1%
<b>Transportation &amp; warehousing, and utilities</b>	6.9%	27.6%	6.8%
<b>Information</b>	0.8%	0.0%	1.1%
<b>Finance, insurance, real estate, &amp; rental and leasing</b>	4.1%	22.4%	5.2%
<b>Professional, scientific, management, administrative, &amp; waste management services</b>	2.9%	0.0%	1.9%
<b>Educational, health &amp; social services</b>	27.4%	0.0%	24.5%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation &amp; food services</b>	4.8%	0.0%	6.3%
<b>Other services (except public administration)</b>	4.7%	0.0%	6.8%
<b>Public administration</b>	4.7%	7.9%	7.1%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

### Population Trends – Conejos County

	Population 1950	Population 2000	Population 2003	Population Forecast 2010	Percentage Change 2003-2010
Conejos County	10,171	8,400	8,457	8,840	4.5%

San Luis Valley Development Resources Group

## **RIO GRANDE COUNTY**

### **Community Setting**

Rio Grande County is located on the western side of the San Luis Valley in south central Colorado. The town of Del Norte is home to the Rio Grande County Museum and Cultural Center. Just north of town, Penitente Canyon offers world-class rock climbing. The City of Monte Vista is Rio Grande's largest city and is an agricultural, social, cultural and business center well rooted in the San Luis Valley. In March of each year, Monte Vista is flooded with visitors who visit for the Crane Festival – a celebration of the migrations of the sandhill crane and the endangered whooping crane. In July of each year, the oldest professional rodeo in Colorado comes to the fairgrounds and attracts many to the area. South Fork is located between the Great Sand Dunes and the Mesa Verde National Park, both of which attract a significant amount of visitors each year.

### **Population and Growth**

Rio Grande County is home to five cities: Center, Del Norte, Homelake, Monte Vista and South Fork. According to the 2000 Census, Rio Grande County has a total population of 12,413. The 2003 population estimate declined to 12,346, a -0.5% change over the three year period. The median age in Rio Grande County is 37 years, of which 15% of the population is 65 years old and over. Those of a race other than white, comprise 26% of the population, while Hispanics or Latinos of any race account for 42% of the population in the county.

According to the 2000 census, the town of Del Norte is home to 1,705 residents. The median resident age in Del Norte is 35 years, with 13% of the population comprised of residents 65 years and over.

The City of Monte Vista has a population of 4,529 according to the 2000 census. The median age in Monte Vista is 34 years, of which 15% of the population is 65 years old and over.

South Fork has only 604 residents according to the year 2000 census. People 18 years of age and older make up 78% of the population while 18% of the population consists of those who are 65 years of age and older.

### **Education**

In Rio Grande County, many students do not pursue a higher education after graduating from high school. In 2000, 78% of students graduated from high school or higher, while only 18.8% obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. Specifically, only 14% received a bachelor's degree and 4.9% received a graduate or professional degree.

Del Norte has a 70% graduate rate from high school or higher, and only 12% of students obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. These numbers are lower than the county average.

Monte Vista has a 74% graduate rate from high school or higher, and only 14% of students obtained a bachelor's degree or higher. South Fork actually has a higher graduate rate from high school than does Monte Vista at 91%, and of those students 30% subsequently received a bachelor's degree or higher.

### Employment, Occupation and Business

The employment status in Rio Grande County, and Del Norte, Monte Vista and South Fork is determined based upon those that are 16 years and over. Del Norte and Monte Vista have 58% of people in the labor force, while South Fork has 59% and the County has 62% in the labor force.

In Rio Grande County the occupations that are the most common is management, professional and related occupations. While in Del Norte, Monte Vista and South Fork, the most common occupations are sales and office occupations at 25%, 28% and 35% respectively.

On a county level, the greatest number of workers is employed in educational, health and social services occupations. Retail trade follows at 13%, while the information industry has the fewest workers with 2% of the population in this industry. A large number of workers in Monte Vista are in the educational, health and social services industry at 24%. In Del Norte, the industry with the greatest percentage of workers are the educational, health and social services. Finally, in South Fork, the most common industry is arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services at 17%. These percentages are figured based on a population set of persons employed in the civilian population who are 16 years and over.

### Residential Trends and Economic Forecast

South Fork, located in Rio Grande County, was initially developed as a community to service lumber and mining operations. While the population of the county has not changed dramatically, many people visit South Fork and the surrounding areas, to venture into the nearly 2 million acres of national forest that surround the city. While the population is not increasing in large increments, there are more visitors to the area who are participating in the local economy.

### Income

According to the 2000 census, the median family income for the City of Monte Vista was \$33,017 and the County's median family income in the same period was \$38,389. Both are lower than the median family income for the City and County of Denver (\$48,195) and for the State of Colorado (\$55,883).

### Population and Growth Profile – Rio Grande

	Rio Grande County		Del Norte		Monte Vista		South Fork	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
<b>Total Population</b>	12,413	100.0	1,705	100.0	4,529	100.0	604	100.0
<b>Population Growth (2000-2003)</b>	-67	-0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Median age (years)</b>	37.3	-	34.6	-	34.4	-	42.8	-
<b>Population 18 years and over</b>	8,919	71.9	1,190	69.8	3,189	70.4	473	78.3
<b>Population 65 years and over</b>	1,822	14.7	218	12.8	661	14.6	106	17.5
<b>One Race</b>	12,070	97.	1,639	96.1	4,403	97.2	583	96.5

	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
		2						
<b>White</b>	9,177	73.9	1,140	66.9	2,857	63.1	561	92.9
<b>Black or African American</b>	43	0.3	2	0.1	17	0.4	1	0.2
<b>American Indian &amp; Alaska Native</b>	157	1.3	18	1.1	73	1.6	2	0.3
<b>Asian</b>	28	0.2	7	0.4	13	0.3	1	0.2
<b>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pacific Islander</b>	3	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.0	0	0.0
<b>Other Race</b>	2,662	21.4	472	27.7	1,441	31.8	18	3.0
<b>Two or more races</b>	343	2.8	66	3.9	126	2.8	21	3.5
<b>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</b>	5,172	41.7	978	57.4	2,636	58.2	75	12.4

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000; STATS Indiana; city-data.com.

### Educational Attainment – Rio Grande

	Rio Grande County	Del Norte	Monte Vista	South Fork
<b>Population 25 years and over</b>	7,959	984	2,736	467
<b>Less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade</b>	11.7%	14.5%	15.9%	2.4%
<b>9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grade, no diploma</b>	10.2%	15.5%	10.6%	6.4%
<b>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</b>	30.0%	32.9%	30.8%	18.0%
<b>Some college, no degree</b>	23.0%	22.9%	21.4%	34.0%
<b>Associate degree</b>	6.3%	2.3%	6.9%	9.4%
<b>Bachelor's degree</b>	13.9%	8.3%	11.2%	18.2%
<b>Graduate or professional degree</b>	4.9%	3.5%	3.3%	11.6%
<b>High School Graduate or higher</b>	78.1%	69.9%	73.5%	91.2%
<b>Bachelor's degree or higher</b>	18.8%	11.8%	14.4%	29.8%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

### Employment Status – Rio Grande

	Rio Grande County	Del Norte	Monte Vista	South Fork
<b>Population 16 years and over</b>	9,321	1,225	3,238	519
<b>In labor force</b>	61.5%	58.6%	58.7%	59.2%
<b>Civilian labor force</b>	61.5%	58.6%	58.7%	59.2%
<b>Employed</b>	57.8%	53.8%	53.7%	57.4%
<b>Unemployed</b>	3.7%	4.8%	5.1%	1.7%
<b>Armed Forces</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Not in labor force</b>	38.5%	41.4%	41.3%	40.8%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Occupation – Rio Grande

	<b>Rio Grande County</b>	<b>Del Norte</b>	<b>Monte Vista</b>	<b>South Fork</b>
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	5,383	659	1,738	298
<b>Management, professional, &amp; related occupations</b>	30.2%	20.6%	25.9%	32.6%
<b>Service occupations</b>	14.7%	19.6%	20.0%	16.1%
<b>Sales &amp; office occupations</b>	24.8%	24.6%	27.7%	34.9%
<b>Farming, fishing, &amp; forestry occupations</b>	6.0%	3.2%	4.9%	3.0%
<b>Construction, extraction, &amp; maintenance occupations</b>	11.8%	12.0%	11.3%	7.4%
<b>Production, transportation, &amp; material moving occupations</b>	12.4%	20.0%	10.1%	6.0%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Business/Industry – Rio Grande

	<b>Rio Grande County</b>	<b>Del Norte</b>	<b>Monte Vista</b>	<b>South Fork</b>
<b>Employed civilian population 16 years and over</b>	5,383	659	1,738	298
<b>Agriculture, forestry, fishing &amp; hunting, and mining</b>	11.0%	4.7%	5.7%	8.7%
<b>Construction</b>	6.9%	8.5%	3.6%	8.4%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	5.2%	8.8%	4.7%	3.4%
<b>Wholesale trade</b>	7.7%	7.6%	7.0%	0.0%
<b>Retail trade</b>	12.7%	10.8%	12.9%	12.1%
<b>Transportation &amp; warehousing, and utilities</b>	5.2%	5.2%	5.6%	6.4%
<b>Information</b>	2.2%	1.8%	4.4%	0.7%
<b>Finance, insurance, real estate, &amp; rental and leasing</b>	5.4%	5.6%	6.4%	13.1%
<b>Professional, scientific, management, administrative, &amp; waste management services</b>	4.9%	2.6%	4.3%	5.4%
<b>Educational, health &amp; social services</b>	19.4%	19.7%	24.1%	11.7%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation &amp; food services</b>	9.1%	13.7%	10.0%	17.4%
<b>Other services (except public administration)</b>	4.9%	5.0%	5.3%	2.7%
<b>Public administration</b>	5.3%	6.1%	5.9%	10.1%

Source: US Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census 2000

## Population Trends – Rio Grande

	Population 1950	Population 2000	Population 2003	Population Forecast 2010	Percentage Change 2003-2010
Rio Grande County	12,832	12,413	12,886	13,633	5.8%

San Luis Valley Development Resources Group





## **APPENDIX 2**

### **List of Contacts**

#### **Agency Contacts**

##### **Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment**

Hazardous Materials and Waste Management Division  
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South  
Denver, CO 80246  
Fax (303) 759-5355  
<http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/hm/summitville.asp>

Derek Boer (se habla español)  
Community Involvement Specialist  
1-888-569-1831 ext. 3329 (toll free), or (303) 692-3329  
E-mail: [derek.boer@state.co.us](mailto:derek.boer@state.co.us)

Austin Buckingham  
Project Manager  
1-888-569-1831 ext. 3435 (toll free), or (303) 692-3435  
E-mail: [austin.buckingham@state.co.us](mailto:austin.buckingham@state.co.us)

##### **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8**

999 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500  
Denver, CO 80202  
Fax (303) 312-6961  
<http://www.epa.gov/region8/superfund/sites/co/sville.html>

Peggy Linn  
Community Involvement Coordinator  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6622 (toll free), or (303) 312-6622  
E-mail: [linn.peggy@epa.gov](mailto:linn.peggy@epa.gov)

James Hanley  
Project Manager  
1-800-227-8917 ext. 6725 (toll free), or (303) 312-6725  
E-mail: [hanley.james@epa.gov](mailto:hanley.james@epa.gov)

## Federal Elected Officials

### U.S. Senate

#### Senator Wayne Allard

Washington, D.C. 521 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg. Washington , D.C. 20510 202-224-5941 Fax: 202-224-6471	Denver 7340 E. Caley, Suite 215 Englewood , CO 80111 303-220-7414 Fax: 303-220-8126
Colorado Springs 111 S. Tejon, Suite 300 Colorado Springs, CO 80903 719-634-6071 Fax: 719-636-2590	Loveland 5401 Stone Creek Circle, Suite 203 Loveland , CO 80538 970-461-3530 Fax: 970-461-3658
Pueblo 411 Thatcher Bldg., 5th & Main Sts. Pueblo , CO 81003 719-545-9751 Fax: 719-545-3832	Durango 954 East Second Avenue, Suite 107 Durango, CO 81301 970-375-6311 Fax: 970-375-1321
Grand Junction 215 Federal Bldg., 400 Rood Ave. Grand Junction , CO 81501 970-245-9553 Fax: 970-245-9523	

#### Senator Ken Salazar

Washington, DC Office 702 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC 20510 202-224-5852 Fax: 202-228-5036	Denver 2300 15th St, Suite 450 Denver, CO 80202 303-455-7600 Fax: 303-455-8851
Colorado Springs 3 South Tejon, Suite 300B Colorado Springs, CO 80903 719-328-1100 Fax: 719-328-1129	Fort Collins 11 Old Town Square, Suite 260 Fort Collins, CO 80524 970-224-2200 Fax: 970-224-2205
Pueblo 129 West B Street Pueblo, CO 81003 719-542-7550 Fax: 719-542-7555	Durango 835 East 2nd Avenue, Suite 203 Durango, CO 81301 970-259-1710 Fax: 970-259-9789
Grand Junction 400 Rood Avenue, Suite 213 Grand Junction, CO 81501 970-241-6631 Fax: 970-241-8313	

**U.S. House of Representatives  
John Salazar, District 3**

Washington, D.C. 1531 Longworth House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515-0603 202-225-4761	Pueblo, Colorado 134 West B. Street Pueblo, CO 81003 719-543-8200
Grand Junction, Colorado 225 North 5th Street, 702 Grand Junction, CO 81501 970-245-7107	Alamosa, Colorado 609 Main Street, #6 Alamosa, CO 81101 719-587-5105 Fax: 719-587-5137
Durango, CO 700 Main Avenue, STE F Durango, CO 81301 970-375-3264 Fax: 970-375-3265	

**State Elected Officials**

**Governor Bill Owens**

136 State Capitol  
Denver, CO 80203-1792  
303-866-2471  
Fax: 303-866-2003

**Colorado General Assembly  
Colorado Senate District 5**

Lewis H. Entz  
200 E. Colfax  
Denver, CO 80203  
303-866-4871  
E-mail: lewis.entz.senate@state.co.us

**Colorado House District 62**

Rafael Lorenzo Gallegos  
200 E. Colfax  
Denver, CO 80203  
303-866-2916  
E-mail: rafael.gallegos.house@state.co.us

## **Local Elected Officials**

### **Alamosa County Commissioners**

Commissioners: Darius Allen, Frank Mestas, George Wilkinson  
PO Box 178  
8900 Independence Way  
Alamosa, CO 81101-0178  
(719) 589-3841  
Fax (719) 589-1900  
Email: commissioner@alamosacounty.org

### **Conejos County Commissioners**

Commissioners: Robert Bagwell, Steve McCarroll, John Sandoval  
6683 County Rd 13  
P.O. Box 157  
Conejos, CO 81129  
(719) 376-5772  
Fax (719) 376-5661

### **Rio Grande County Commissioners**

Commissioners: Dennis Murphy, Jr., Doug Davie, Randy Brown  
925 6th Street  
Del Norte, CO 81132  
(719) 657-2744  
Email: rgcommissioner@riograndecounty.org

## **Community Groups**

### **Summitville Technical Assistance Group**

Amy Brady, Grant Administrator  
P.O. Box 65  
La Jara, CO 81140

### **Alamosa River Keepers**

Cindy Medina,  
P.O. Box 355  
La Jara, CO 81140

## Local Media

### Newspapers

#### **Valley Courier**

Box 1099  
Alamosa CO 81101  
719-589-2553  
719-589-6573 Fax

#### **Monte Vista Journal**

229 Adams St  
Monte Vista CO 81144  
719-852-3531  
719-852-3387 Fax

#### **The Pueblo Chieftain**

Post Office Box 4040  
825 West Sixth Street  
Pueblo, Colorado 81003  
(719) 544-3520

### Radio Stations

#### **KGIW Radio**

Box 179  
Alamosa CO 81101  
719-589-6644  
719-589-0993 Fax

#### **KSLV Radio**

Box 631  
109 Adams  
Monte Vista CO 81144  
719-852-3581  
719-852-3583 Fax

#### **KRZA Radio**

Box 1660  
Alamosa CO 81101  
719-589-9057  
719-587-0032 Fax



### **APPENDIX 3**

#### **Information Repositories**

U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Conejos County Natural Resources  
Conservation Service Center  
15 Spruce  
La Jara, CO 81140

Del Norte Public Library  
790 Grand Ave.  
Del Norte, CO 81132

#### **Administrative Records**

Records Center  
Colorado Department of Public Health & Environment  
Hazardous Materials & Waste Management Division  
4300 Cherry Creek Drive South, Room B-215  
Denver, CO 80246-1530

Superfund Records Center  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8  
999 18th St., Suite 300  
Denver, CO 80202





## **APPENDIX 4**

### **Community Meeting Locations**

#### **Summitville**

Meet at Summitville's Del Norte Office  
14443 Highway 160  
Del Norte, CO

#### **La Jara**

Centauri High School  
Band Room or Superintendent's Board Room  
17890 State Highway 285  
La Jara, Colorado

#### **Capulin**

Valle de Sol Community Center  
19880 CR 8  
Capulin, CO 81124

#### **Alamosa**

Alamosa Court House  
402 Edison Ave  
Alamosa, CO 81101  
719-589-4848  
719-589-1900 Fax



## **APPENDIX 5**

### **Interview Questionnaire**

#### **Summitville Mine Superfund Site 5-Year Review Community Involvement Plan Update**

##### **Interview Questions:**

1. Are you aware of the environmental cleanup program currently underway at Summitville Mine Site?  
[Alternate question for informed interviewees: What is your level of awareness of the environmental cleanup activities at Summitville?]
2. How and when did you learn about it?
3. What is your primary source of information about Summitville?
4. Do you think that the environmental problems at Summitville are being adequately addressed?
5. What are your primary concerns about the environmental cleanup at Summitville?
6. Have you been involved in developing the watershed restoration plan for the Alamosa River?
7. Have conditions in the Alamosa River improved since 1992? What do you think has improved?
8. What are your concerns for river restoration on the Alamosa River?
9. How have you been involved in the Summitville clean-up process?
10. Have you been satisfied with your involvement and the information you have received?
11. How often would you like having community meetings? Best time of year, day and time?
12. Are you aware of the Summitville information repositories? Do you use the information repositories?
13. How would you like to be involved in the future?
14. If you wanted information about the cleanup at Summitville, how would you try to obtain it?
15. How do you usually get information about the cleanup at Summitville?
16. To catch up on other news in the community, what sources do you use?
17. Do you use the Internet to access CDPHE and EPA's Summitville web sites?
18. How do you prefer to receive information about Summitville (e.g., television, newspapers, mailings, other)? What sources do you prefer?
19. How frequently would you like to receive information? Monthly, quarterly, semiannually, annually?
20. Is there anything you would like to add?
21. Is there anyone else you think we should be talking to?
22. Would you like a copy of this plan when complete?