Gold King Mine Spill
Cause of Mine Blowout

- Push Steel pipe through the collapsed soil
- Unconsolidated collapsed material
- Waste rock
- Bedrock
- Adit/Tunnel Roof
- Exaggeration Point
- Water Level
- Adit/Tunnel Floor
- Exaggeration Point
“The Gold King Mine has not had maintenance of the mine working since 1991, and the workings have been inaccessible since 1995 when the mine portal collapsed. This condition has likely caused impounding of water behind the collapse…Conditions may exist that could result in a blow-out of the blockages and cause a release of large volumes of contaminated mine waters and sediment from inside the mine, which contain concentrated heavy metals.”
EPA’s Credibility Issues

EPA statement regarding the Animas and San Juan Rivers (November 13, 2015):

“…metals, including arsenic, cadmium, lead and mercury in surface water and sediment have returned to pre-event conditions…”

- EPA has not defined background conditions.
- EPA’s own data suggests the metals in surface water and sediment have not returned to pre-event conditions.
Storm Events and High River Flow

Plume arrives in NM; peak flow at Cedar Hill Station recorded 8/8/2015 @ 786 cfs

Total Lead in the Animas and San Juan Rivers
New Mexico

EPA Drinking Water Action Level

EPA Credibility Issues

EPA’s FAQ Website:
“We are certain that crops are safe for consumption. When the plume came through, irrigation ditches that impacted crops and livestock were shut down.”

Willett Irrigation Ditch
Farmington, NM
August 8, 2015
EPA Risk Levels for Lead in Sediment

mg/Kg (parts per million)

EPA has been using the 20,000 mg/Kg screening level for comparison with sediment data, while virtually disregarding other risk screening levels designed to protect human health in residential areas as well as plants and wildlife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPA Screening Level for GKM Spill</th>
<th>EPA Screening Level for Residential Soil</th>
<th>EPA Screening Level for Plants</th>
<th>EPA Screening Level for Soil Invertebrates</th>
<th>EPA Screening Level for Birds</th>
<th>EPA Screening Level for Mammals</th>
<th>EPA Superfund Cleanup Level (Dallas, TX site)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples discussed above are consistent with an agenda to deny and downplay the severity of the GKM Spill.

EPA is not holding itself to the same high standards for site investigation and remediation that it routinely imposes on the regulated community.

An independent long term monitoring plan is needed to protect and inform the communities impacted by the GKM Spill.
Path Forward for New Mexico

1) Reimbursement for Emergency Response Costs
2) Long Term Monitoring Plan for Watershed
3) Remediate Abandoned Mines in the Upper Animas Watershed
NM’s Response Costs

- New Mexico spent $1.6 Million on emergency response effort
- New Mexico will need $5 million to fully implement long term monitoring plan
- EPA estimates its response effort will cost over $19.6 Million
New Mexico’s GKM Spill
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